36460

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
APR - 7 1978
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* THOMAS RICHARD POETSCHKE

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* REASONS FOR IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC IDENTITY: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF GERMAN IMMIGRANTS IN EDMONTON, ALBERTA

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* EDMONTON ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1978

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* PROFESSOR BAHA ABU-LABAN

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* March 5, 1978 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* T R Poetschke

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE* DEPT. OF SOC & ANTHROPOLOGY
CARLETON UNIVERSITY
OTTAWA, ONT.

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

REASONS FOR IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC IDENTITY: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF GERMAN IMMIGRANTS IN EDMONTON, ALBERTA

by

© Thomas R. Poetschke

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1978

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Reasons for Immigration and Ethnic Identity: An Exploratory Study of German Immigrants in Edmonton, Alberta submitted by Thomas Richard Poetschke in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Supervisor

Date July 16, 1976

ABSTRACT

This is an exploratory study of the relationship between reasons for immigration and different dimensions of ethnic identity. For the purpose of the study, interviews were held with 78 German immigrants in Edmonton, Alberta. A typology of reasons for immigration was developed on the basis of an in-depth probing of the respondents' reasons for immigration. The two types identified were an "instrumental" type of response termed "better elsewhere," and, an "aspiration-to-solidarity" type of response, termed "fear-of-instability." The dimensions of ethnic identity employed by this study were endogamy, religion, language, friends, citizenship, and self-ethnic identification. Significant relationships between the identified types of reasons and linguistic and endogamous identity were found; and, although the relationship between the reasons and the citizenship dimension was not statistically significant, it approached significance. These findings were consistent with Eisenstadt's model. That is, those respondents who gave the "fear-of-instability" type of response tended to have weaker ethnic identities because their "aspirations-to-solidarity" were not met in Germany; and, those respondents who gave the "better-elsewhere" type of response tended to have stronger commitments to their

ethnic identities because their reasons for immigrating were of the "instrumental" type, and were therefore not necessarily a reflection of a negative valence to their ethnic identities. Suggestions for future research employing Eisenstadt's model and the derived typology were made.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to certain individuals and organizations. I wish, particularly, to acknowledge my appreciation of the innumerable occasions on which Professor Baha Abu-Laban gave me encouragement and advice. I am also indebted to Professors Hobart and Fisher, for valuable suggestions throughout all stages of this research.

I would also like to acknowledge my appreciation of the interest and generosity of the Edmonton German community, who gave freely of their time in the interviews. And, I am grateful to the German-Canadian Business and Professional Association of Alberta for their interest in this project and for financing some of the costs of this study.

I would also like to acknowledge my appreciation for insights derived in conversations with certain individuals. In particular, I would like to thank Raymond Pong, Charles Humphreys, and Dr. David Nock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Organization of the thesis	3
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW: THE RESEARCH PROBLEM STATED	5
	Research on Reasons for Immigration	5
	The Aggregate Approach	5
	The Individual Approach	6
	The mono-factor approach	6
	The multi-factor approach	10
	Reasons for Immigration and Ethnic Identity	14
	The Research Problem	16
III.	METHODS	19
	The Population and the Sample	19
	The Interview Schedule	22
	The Main Variables Studied	25
	Reasons for Immigration	26
	Ethnic Identity	27
	Approach "A"	27
	Approach "B"	30
	Socio-Demographic Variables	31
	The German-block	33
	The Canadian-block	39
	Data Analysis	40
	Summary	43
IV.	FINDINGS: ETHNIC IDENTITY	44
	Results of Factor Analysis	44
	The Single-Question Approach: Self-Ethnic Identity and Citizenship Hesitancy	49
	Summary	49

CHAPTER Page

V. FINDINGS: REASONS FOR IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC IDENTITY 51

Toward a Typology of Reasons for Immigration 51

The Lead-in or Unprobed Question . . . 51

The Probed Question 52

The Relationship Between Reasons for Immigration and Ethnic Identity 62

Reasons for Immigration and Linguistic Identity 65

Reasons for Immigration and Endogamous Identity 69

Reasons for Immigration and Citizenship Hesitation 74

Discussion 76

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 80

BIBLIOGRAPHY 90

APPENDIX A--SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVENESS 98

Estimates of the Population Size . . . 98

Estimate Number One 98

Estimate Number Two 99

The Sample as a Proportion of the Population 99

Possible Source of Sample Bias 99

APPENDIX B--THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 103

APPENDIX C--ITEMS COMPRISING THE DIMENSIONS 111

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Percent of Frequency Distribution for each of the Dimensions of Ethnic Identity	32
2	Percent and Frequency Distribution of the German-block Variables	38
3	Percent and Frequency Distribution of the Canadian-block Variables	41
4	The Factor Structure of Ethnic Identity	46
5	Factor Intercorrelations	48
6	Unprobed Reasons for Immigration: Percent and Frequency Distributions	53
7	Probed Reasons for Immigration: Percent and Frequency Distributions	54
8	Probed Reasons for Immigration by High Linguistic Identity	59
9	Occupation-in-Germany by the Probed Reasons for Immigration	63
10	Probed Reasons for Immigration by Linguistic Identity Controlled for the Effects of Educational Attainment	68
11	Probed Reasons for Immigration by Endogamy, Controlled for the Effects of Marital Status at the Time of Immigration	71
12	Probed Reasons for Immigration by Endogamy, Controlled for the Different Types of German Background	73
13	Probed Reasons for Immigration by Endogamy, Controlled for the Effects of Marital Status Prior to Immigration and the Type of German Background	75
14	Percent Distributions of German Religious Preferences	101
15	Frequency and Percent Distribution of German and Other Ethnic Immigrant Ages at the Time of Immigration	102

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationships between reasons for immigration and different dimensions of ethnic identity. More specifically, an attempt will be made to develop a typology of reasons for immigration and relate each of the types identified to each of the dimensions of ethnic identity to be uncovered in the study. It is here assumed that the nature and strength of ethnic identity in the new environment of the receiving country would be influenced by the structuring of reasons for immigration, among other factors. For the purpose of the study, a sample of first-generation German immigrants was selected and lengthy interviews were held with a total of 78 respondents.

Recent research in Canada has not confirmed the expectation that the reasons people give for immigration would be intimately related to immigrant adjustment in the host society. This negative finding is probably due to several reasons of which the approach used may be an important one. For example, many studies have employed what appears to be a superficial conception of immigration (Richmond:1974; Grace Anderson:1974; The First Report of the Longitudinal Study of the Economic and Social Adaptation

of Immigrants: 1974). None of these studies have seriously considered the fact that for the majority of immigrants the reasons for migration are multiple rather than singular. Unfortunately, the aforementioned studies have tended to skim the surface only of reasons for immigration.

In this study, an attempt will be made to develop a typology of reasons for immigration which would avoid these methodological problems. The expectation would be that if the typology was more empirically grounded and 'representative' (Brunswik:1956), then elements of the distal situation would be related to current behavior in Canada. Ethnic identity has been treated in the literature both as a dependent and an independent variable. In this study, ethnic identity will be treated mainly as the dependent variable, while reasons for immigration will be treated as the independent variable. The present approach may contribute to a view of ethnic identity as a process which begins in the country of emigration and develops in accordance with the aspirations of the immigrants, and the types and degrees of pluralism in the host country. This view is of considerable theoretical and practical relevance for Canada.

Rather than deal with ethnic identity as an 'opaque' global concept, this study will measure attitudes toward ethnic identification using a modified version of Driedger's (1975) scale. This approach would yield a multi-dimensional conception of ethnic identity and produce quantitative

variables which could be used as dependent variables. Moreover, the use of this method will allow the exploration of the antecedent, intervening, and conditional relationships between reasons for immigration, socio-demographic variables, and each dimension of ethnic identity.

The theoretical and practical significance of this type of investigation is obvious. Ethnic interests vary. The expression of ethnic identity may occur along several dimensions and with varying intensities. Sometimes the expression may be through language demands, while at other times it may involve a decreased association with members of outgroups, or a tendency to Nationalism, religiosity, and/or citizenship. By exploring the conditions antecedent to these dimensions, both in Germany and Canada where possible, it would be possible to develop new hypotheses concerning factors which may influence different forms of ethnic identity expression.

Organization of the Thesis

Chapter II will provide a review of the literature and describe how the approach used and the basic areas of investigation to be covered grew out of ideas generated by the literature. Chapter III will specify the main issues influencing the design of the research. It will isolate the most important variables, describe the interview schedule and the sample; and, it will show how relationships

basic to the study will be investigated using certain statistical techniques. Chapter IV will present the findings on ethnic identity. Chapter V will present the findings on reasons for immigration and discuss the typology of reasons in terms of the theoretical significance of the typology. A second section of this chapter will present the findings on the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity dimensions. Chapter VI will provide a recapitulation of the theoretical issues and empirical findings. Contributions and shortcomings of the study will be discussed in the second part of this chapter, and this will be followed by suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW: THE RESEARCH PROBLEM STATED

Research on Reasons for Immigration

Approaches to the study of the reasons for immigration may be structured into two main directions. One focuses on immigration at 'macro-levels' in terms of social system variables such as political, economic, and social forces; the other stresses the importance of the individual as a decision maker on a more 'micro-level' confrontation with political, social, and economic factors. The former will be referred to as the aggregate approach and the latter will be termed the individual approach.

The Aggregate Approach

This approach usually involves the use of concepts of push and/or pull forces assumed to be operating in the donor and/or receiving countries to explain immigration. Some investigators (Fairchild:1913:14) stress the greater importance of the push factors in overcoming the intensity of the local bonds, while others (Reid:1973) place greater emphasis on pull forces such as employment opportunities and friends and relatives. However, the majority of researchers favor an explanatory framework which utilizes

some combination of push and pull forces. Thus, several qualitative studies (Kaye:1964:xiii-4; Fried:1966:32; Hanson and Brebner:1940; MacDonald:1966:1) argue that deprivation pressures such as overpopulation push the immigrants, and that they are pulled by expectations of better opportunities. A number of recent studies (Fairchild:1913: 10-24; Petersen:1964:277-290; Richmond:1974) consider the push and pull forces in the broader context of evolving socio-cultural systems producing waves of immigration with differences seen as functions of the underlying socio-cultural conditions. On the other hand, quantitative attempts have been made (Samuel:1969; Lee:1966:53; Reid: 1973; Vanderkamp:1973; and Hollingsworth:1970) to measure the economic push and pull forces using macro-economic concepts such as average wage and gross national product differentials.

The description of immigration in terms of qualitative deprivation and future expectations and the measurement of economic push and pull forces have provided insights into the dynamics of the immigration process. Accumulated evidence, however, suggests that the relations between forces operating in the donor and receiving countries are more complex than the aggregate approaches have portrayed. For example, the view of immigrants being pushed out of their native environments by severe deprivation pressures does not generally apply to the modern Western World

emigrants. It appears (Appleyard:1964) to be accumulated frustrations rather than insufferable poverty which determines the decision to immigrate. Even the view that economic deprivation of a lesser intensity directly pushes the immigration movement is inapplicable to some situations. Hollingsworth (1970:100), for example, has found that high incomes and low status are associated with high mobility in the 1939 to 1964 Scottish out-migrant populations. He argues that the relationship between economic change and out-migration is complex rather than direct, and concludes that there is ". . . little relationship between economic conditions in Scotland and the level of net migration from Scotland" (p.126). In fact, it has been argued (Petersen: 1964:274-277) that there is often a negative correlation between deprivation in the home country and emigration. Indeed, many investigators have found that immigration waves rise and fall with fluctuations in the economy of the receiving not the donor countries.

Inconsistencies between aggregate theory and immigrant behavior suggest that the macro-conception of immigration may assume too much commonality among immigrants. It has been pointed out (C. Tilly: in Anderson:1974) that migration is a marginal form of social behavior in which the immigrant 'group' is elusive. This suggests that push and pull forces might differentially effect immigrants. Thus,

a study of these forces on the individual level within a national group are likely to yield some useful findings.

The Individual Approach

The fact that the individual immigration decision can be structured in terms of push and pull factors provides a bridge between the aggregate and the individual approaches. The individual approach can be characterized in terms of its tendency to emphasize either the most important main reason given (the mono-factor approach), or a configuration of reasons given for the decision to immigrate (the multi-factor approach). The former tends to yield a view of immigration as a single 'one-shot act', while the latter approach represents immigration as a process with a dynamism of its own.

The mono-factor approach. Several investigators (Richmond:1967:28; Anderson:1974:20-22; Vol. IV: The Green Paper:1974:126-127) have used the mono-factor approach in the case of immigrants studied in Canada. Appleyard (1964: 146-178) has used it in his study of the British in Australia as well. By comparing the results of the above studies, several facts about the relations between national origins and the reasons given for immigration can be deduced: national differences in the distribution of main reasons given show that national origin influences the decision to migrate; national differences in the content of the reasons

show that certain cultures have unique immigration influencing factors, thus inhibiting certain cross-cultural comparisons; and, individual differences in the distribution of main reasons given for any one national group show that the national origin effect operates differentially upon individuals. Thus, a profitable line for investigation would be the study of individual differences in reasons given for immigration within one national group.

However, the use of the mono-factor approach for such an investigation raises some difficulties; chief among which is its isolation of one reason from both the other reasons given for immigration, and from the context of the immigration process. One aspect of this difficulty is the empirical fact that emigrants do give multiple reasons for their decision to migrate, and to fail to take into account these other reasons may misrepresent the decision process. Several investigators (Richmond:1974; Anderson:1974; Appleyard:1964) have noted the high frequency of multiple reasons given by respondents for making their move. Appleyard (1964:163) concludes that:

> . . . by far the majority of emigrants stated that their decisions were the result of a number of disappointments or frustrations; or, as Eisenstadt puts it, a feeling of some kind of insecurity and inadequacy in their social setting.

The fact that many respondents are multiply-motivated raises the question of the accuracy of the procedure of selecting only one main reason. For instance, it has been

noted (Appleyard:1964:161) that ". . . it is not always easy for these people to describe the incidents and 'forces' which led them to step across the emigration threshold . . . what is stated may only be a convenient peg upon which to hand the justification for leaving." Others (Petersen:1954: 44) have warned that since the modern potential immigrants are in an unstable state of equilibrium such that only a minor push is required, then the stated reason for immigration is liable to be either trivial, or the generalities they think are expected. Since the interview is often the first time the individual has thought about his reasons for immigrating, then the use of the mono-factor approach increases the risk of getting 'expected generality' responses.

The multi-factor approach. Several investigators (Thomas and Znaniecki in Madge:1964; Edwards:1965:33; Eisenstadt:1954:2-5) provide theories of immigration which incorporate individual and social system dynamics into a configurational explanation of immigration. They argue that a condition of frustration, termed differently as 'the frustration of the four elemental wishes,' 'balked disposition,' and 'the failure to gratify expectations,' predispose the potential migrant to migrate. They argue that the conditions of frustrations and anxieties may have different causes, depending on the levels of social and economic progress within the donor countries. Eisenstadt (1954) argues, for example, that the failure to gratify expectations in the adaptive,

instrumental, solidarity, and worthwhile pattern of life spheres during the era of massive immigrations due to the stress of overpopulation, are closely related to the social and economic conditions of the times. With reference to Eisenstadt's (1954:228) study, these conditions include: the decomposition of the medieval and mercantilist economy in Europe and the rise of autonomous economic motivation and achievement orientation; the rise of modern political institutions and ideologies and the development of aspirations toward liberalism and democracy and of general universalistic orientations; and, the development of individualism and the gradual transformation of traditional group life and of traditional value orientations and identifications.

There is some evidence (Brown:1956) to support the view that immigrants are more anxious and frustrated than non-migrants; and, (Richardson:1959) that intending migrants are more ambitious, more motivated, and more interested in hard work and action than non-migrants. Thus, at a socio-psychological level, the general view of frustration and anxiety as the motor of immigration seems to be substantiated. However, while this provides a possible explanation of <u>why</u> individuals emigrate, there is still a need to determine <u>how</u> this process of frustration occurs in modern settings.

Some theoretical answers to the question of the nature of the relationship between the accumulation of frustrations at the individual level and social structural

processes are provided by Brody (1969:132). He argues that the development of the individual internal system, (made up of distillates of ungratified wishes and a multiplicity of other factors) is a process. This process interacts with another process--the increasing differentiation of society into sub-systems. It is the interaction of these two complex processes which determines emigration. Brody (1969:16) notes that:

> . . . sub-systems, by virtue of their differences in density, isolation, and the physical or socio-cultural barriers to intercommunication, may provide means permitting the actor to move away from involvement with core aspects of the system . . . as the number and frequency of these dissociation-from-the-core-experiences increase, the individual will become progressively withdrawn from the system, and it seems likely that he will eventually migrate.

There is some evidence to support Brody's theory. For example, Brown (1956) has found that migrants are more 'responsive' to their environment than non-migrants. In a similar vein, Frijda (1959) has found that Dutch emigrants display a fairly profound dissatisfaction with life in Holland, and have a "slighter attachment to the Dutch culture pattern" than do non-migrants. Although these findings cannot be generalized to all cultures and to all contexts, they are nevertheless noteworthy.

One may include within the conception of 'dissociation-from-the-core' the focus on a shift in identifications. That is, as the individual shifts his identifications from those at the core of his society to those at the periphery of his

society, he becomes "divided" (Horowitz:1975:115-121) in terms of his allegiances within that society. However, as the contraction of boundaries continues and the subsequent division of identificational loyalties increases, it is possible that the process will terminate by the individual shifting his identifications from the local, regional, or national groups to the international sphere, and emigrate.

However, it should be noted that not all emigrants leave because of frustration and experiences of dissociation-from-the-core. The high rates of return migration between countries imply that in many cases the reasons underlying the immigration may be travel and adventure, temporary career strategies, or migration for some reasons other than the inability to identify strongly with one's original setting. Furthermore, (Appleyard:1964:150), not all emigrants are multiply-motivated. Elder parents who immigrate to reunite with their offspring and young people who immigrate to enjoy travel and adventure, constitute two types of immigrants who are influenced by one main reason only. Another type of immigrant appears to be motivated solely by career reasons. Richmond (1969) argues that in industrial and post-industrial societies where international career orbits make emigration an occupational necessity, a professional occupational type of immigrant has emerged. Although there have been no in-depth studies of this type of immigrant, the preliminary data collected for this research show that

immigrants who correspond to Richmond's "transilient type" seem to move for the purpose of advancing their careers. However, the pilot interviews also show a larger proportion of immigrants, quite distinct from the careerists, who are motivated by a multiplicity of factors. It seems clear that there is a need for an empirical typological approach which can apply a combination of the mono-factor and multi-factor approaches to the study of reasons for immigration.

Reasons for Immigration and Ethnic Identity

Several investigators have speculated about the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity retention and some empirical research has been done in this area. For example, some Mennonites were found (Driedger:1973:268) to have been impelled to immigrate in order to retain their ethnic identity. Another study (Richmond in Hawkins:1978:8) has found that the transilient type of immigrant is less committed to the host country than the non-transilient immigrant. However, in Richmond's study the question of the salience of ethnic identity can be raised since the transilient type may not be committed to either the 'old' or the 'new' cultures.

Investigators in Canada (Hawkins:1972:21) and the United States (Fishman:1966:28) have noted the changes in the characteristics of immigrants since World War II. They relate these characteristics to differences in the positions immigrants have been taking toward the cultures of their

adopted countries. Hawkins argues that modern migration is characterized by a substantial professional and managerial component, by better educated immigrants, and by a wider class representation. The modern emigrant is better informed, more mobile, and more cautious. Fishman (1966:28) observes that the greater proportion of immigrants with formal educational training in their mother tongue, and with disciplined study of their literary standard and their literature, results in the tendency for these emigrants to possess strong and conscious national sentiments toward their country of origin. He adds that such characteristics may have immediate positive consequences for the maintenance of language and language loyalty. However, he raises the question of whether the possession of such characteristics would have positive consequences for the retention of ethnic identity, or whether they would make Americanization even more rapid and less painful.

H. Palmer's (1975) historical sketch of Canadian immigration suggests one answer to Fishman's question. One could link the changing class composition of post-World War II immigrants to the demands for multiculturalism, and argue that the professional type of immigrant leads these demands. Since those of Ukrainian descent from professional and executive families were found (Bociurkiw:1966:28) to have the highest degree of identification with and commitment to Ukrainian affairs, Palmer's position has some empirical

support. However, Bociurkiw's sample includes first, second, and third generation immigrants, many of whom were presumably pre-World War II immigrants or descendents of pre-World War II immigrants. Thus, Bociurkiw's study seems to support the observation that professional and executive occupational types identify more strongly with their ethnicity than do non-professionals; but, the findings may not apply to the new professional occupational-type of postwar immigrant.

The Research Problem

The fact that macro-level studies have provided confusing results illustrates that the relationship between migration and socio-economic change is complex, and that individual-level study of this relationship might be a more appropriate level of analysis. Unfortunately, individual-level studies have also failed to 'bridge the gap' between migration and socio-economic change. The above review of the literature suggests that this may be because they have tended to neglect the facts that many immigrants give multiple reasons for immigration, and that many respondents will give the interviewer the 'expected generalities' they think the interviewer wants to hear. These problems may be circumvented by conducting an in-depth probe of the reasons given for immigration coupled with an analysis of the patterns of the reasons thus established. The results of the application of this approach may lead to the development

of a typology of reasons for immigration which is empirically grounded and is thus more representative of the 'distal' complex of reasons for immigration.

The review of the literature further suggests that since the emigrant is one who has become progressively dissociated-from-the-core of his society, then his reasons for emigrating should be related to his attitudes toward ethnic identity when he has arrived in Canada. There are two main directions to be followed in the investigation of this relationship, although the absence of information upon which to develop specific hypotheses suggests that in each case these directions should be framed as questions to explore rather than hypotheses to test. First, what dimensions of ethnic identity will reasons for immigration be related to? One may inquire in advance about which of the dimensions found in Driedger's (1975) Winnipeg sample will also be found in the Edmonton sample? Will the items making up the dimensions be the same? Second, are certain socio-economic and socio-demographic groups more or less prone to high levels of commitment to ethnic identity? Are more recent immigrants more intense about their identities than the earlier wave of immigrants? What other socio-demographic variables are associated with the dimension of ethnic identity?

Thus, the research is guided by the following questions:

1. Given an empirically grounded typology of reasons for immigration and given measures of dimensions of ethnic

identity, what is the relationship between these reasons and these dimensions of ethnic identity?

2. What other socio-economic or socio-demographic variables are important influences on the dimensions of ethnic identity?

In Chapter III we will discuss the procedures followed in this exploratory study, and in Chapters IV and V the discussion will center around the above research questions.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The methods followed in this investigation were influenced to a large degree by the exploratory nature of the study, as well as the writer's limited resources. First, the study had to be limited in scope to allow for a detailed investigation of the main variables. Second, for present purposes the interview technique seemed to be more appropriate than a mail-out questionnaire, mainly because of the need for obtaining as much information as possible on reasons for immigration and ethnic identity. Additionally, the interview technique would likely provide new insights into the relationship between these two variables. Third, given the limited resources available, the size of the sample had to be limited considerably, but not to the point of jeopardizing the objectives of the study. Fourth and finally, the study was limited to one ethnic group, the German community of Edmonton, Alberta, partly because of the small size of the sample envisaged and partly because of the value of controlling for ethnicity-related variables.

The Population and the Sample

For the purpose of the study, the population to be sampled is defined as German males who immigrated to Canada

between 1949 and 1969, and who were from 5 to 50 years of age when they arrived in this country. The study is limited to male respondents in order to control for sex. Because of the five-year waiting time before being eligible to apply for Canadian citizenship, the study is limited to those immigrants who came to Canada in or before 1969. There are no precise statistics on the size of the target population, but according to Appendix A it is estimated to be between 4,300 and 5,100 persons.

Unfortunately, the target population is too 'well hidden' to allow the selection of a random sample. Danziger (1971), for example, attempted to employ a random sampling procedure in his Toronto survey of Germans and Italians, but had to give up on this procedure in the case of the Germans, because of the 'invisibility' of the German group. Danziger (1971:32) stated that:

> . . . it proved much more difficult to find a group of German immigrant children than a group of Italians. This was due to the striking difference in the settlement patterns of German and Italian immigrants. The former are not to be found in high concentration in any identifiable area of residence . . . Nowhere does the density of German immigrants approach figures that even remotely approach those characteristic of the main areas of Italian settlement.

This observation was substantiated by more recent data provided by O'Bryan et al. (1975:455).

In view of the above difficulty, as well as the prohibitive cost of a probability sample, a purposive sample of 80 persons was selected. As indicated above, only male,

post-War German immigrants between the ages of 5 and 50 years were included in the sample.

It should be pointed out that originally, the sample size was set at 40 respondents, but following a score of interviews it became necessary to double the sample size. The reason for this was to obtain equal representation of two types of German respondents--Volksdeutsche and Reichsdeutsche. The socio-cultural context of these two types of Germans are significantly different and it was felt necessary to obtain a sufficient number of respondents from each category.

The decisions concerning the sample and its characteristics may have influenced the findings of this study. For example, restricting the sample to only the post-War immigrants, and to only males, may have resulted in a less ethnically committed sample. That is, it has been argued (Schneider, in Parsons, T., 1975:66) that in most ethnic groups the mother is the symbolic guardian of ethnic identity. Thus, the exclusion of the females may have resulted in a distortion of the picture of ethnic identity attitudes in the Edmonton immigrant German population. Similarly, it has been argued (Hawkins: 1972; Richmond:1969) that post-War immigrants differ from the pre-War immigrants in terms of the former's better education, more-urban background, and wider class representation. Thus, the attitudes of those interviewed in this study may not be representative of the immigrant generation of Edmonton Germans as a whole. Since the pre-War

immigrants were most often agriculturalists, and since the rural orientation tends to be associated with traditionalism, then it follows that the sample which was interviewed may be less traditional, and perhaps less involved in their ethnic identities, than the pre-War immigrants.

Age was a problem in this study. On the one hand, it was considered important to obtain as wide a range of ages as possible; but, on the other hand, there were difficulties expected in the evaluation of the accuracy of the retrospective responses of the different age groups. As a compromise, only 5 respondents between the ages of 5 and 11 were interviewed. The remainder of the sample were between the ages of 12 and 50 at the time of immigration.

The Interview Schedule

The author collected the data for this study using an interview approach. A series of pilot interviews were conducted in the fall of 1975 to establish the final format for the interview schedule (Appendix B). The interviews proper took place between March and May of 1976 in Edmonton, Alberta. On the average, the length of each interview was approximately 45 minutes, the range being between 30 minutes and two hours.

The respondents' motivation to cooperate in the study appeared to be extremely high in most cases. There were no instances of failure to establish a working 'rapport.' This may have been due to the subject matter of

the interviews. Many of the respondents seldom articulated their reflections on their previous lives in Germany because they were afraid they might give Canadian listeners the impression that they preferred Germany to Canada. To avoid this problem the respondents interviewed had tended to avoid the subject of Germany. Thus, the interview situation was for many of the respondents the first time they had revealed their attitudes. One suspects that this may have been one important reason for their strong interest in dealing with the questions posed in this study.

Each respondent was interviewed according to the format of the interview schedule. Because of the exploratory goal of specifying the variables important to ethnic identity, the questions were designed to 'tap' a wide range of variables related to ethnic identity suggested by common sense, theory, and data. Attitudes to ethnic identity were measured by the use of Driedger's Ethnic Cultural Attitudinal Inventory (ECAI), and single-item scales, one on citizenship, and the other two on self-ethnic identification. For questions with an open ended format, the responses were probed in-depth. It was anticipated that in the case of reasons for immigration, for example, the more in-depth probing approach would be more likely to uncover the general pattern underlying the stated motives for immigration. For issues which did not require an exploratory treatment, the standard survey approach was used.

It is recognized that there are problems of validity and reliability with questions involving retrospection. A number of circumstances might have led to distortions in the responses given to the questions asked. There is no conclusive evidence to indicate that the respondents gave accurate answers. They might have given responses which built up their status in their own (or in the interviewer's) 'eyes'; they might simply not have recalled the specifics of the past situation; or, they might have 're-arranged' these specifics in their own mind for conceptual clarity, but in this process they might have left out the essentials.

To minimize some of the above problems, the writer questioned those responses which appeared to be inconsistent, and the issues were explored until the particular inconsistency (and any other which might have surfaced during the check) had been given an adequate explanation. While the researcher is satisfied that he was able to resolve the inconsistencies which he detected, it is not possible to argue that the responses obtained to these retrospective questions represent 'the real reasons.' By virtue of their retrospective nature, they may have contained distortion.

Not only the respondent, but also the interviewer may have contributed to distortion in the responses. By highlighting certain kinds of responses which he felt were important the interviewer may have directed the responses. Although an attempt was made to avoid interviewer biasing

effects by attempting to appear as detached as possible during the interview, nevertheless, interviewer bias may have occurred.

The interview schedule asked questions in a number of areas relevant to the study. The initial "warm-up" questions were designed to relax the respondents while at the same time eliciting information about their backgrounds. These were followed by a set of questions which could be described as the respondent's 'immigration history.' There were also a number of questions which explored the satisfaction of the respondent with his life in Germany. The remaining sets of questions were associated mainly with the situation of the respondent in Canada. They included questions on employment history, attitudes toward citizenship, the use of ethnic organizations and the German language, the perceptions of discrimination directed at them, and the current socio-economic status of each respondent. The remaining questions explored respondent attitudes toward ethnic identity and multiculturalism. The following section will elaborate on certain parts of the interview schedule.

The Main Variables Studied

Three basic sets of variables were investigated in this research. They included reasons for immigration, ethnic identity, and socio-demographic variables.

Reasons for Immigration

Reasons for immigration were investigated by asking two open-ended questions.[1] The first question, made up of two parts, was designed to lead into the area of reasons for immigration. The first part of the question asked: "In what year did you first begin to think of immigrating to Canada?"; and the second part of this question asked: "What made you think of Canada at that time?"

The second question was designed to more fully explore the reasons. It asked the respondent to explain why he immigrated to Canada. Responses to this question were checked for inconsistency and then recorded. Each set of answers to this question was subsequently analyzed for its dominant patterns. Unfortunately, the existing theory and data in this area were not sufficient to provide a rationale for organizing these responses into patterns. Consequently, the responses were examined by using two different approaches. One of these involved differentiating between the responses in terms of quantity. That is, responses were examined in terms of the number of reasons given for immigration, with one type of response involving only one reason (mono-reason response) and the other involving a multiplicity of reasons (multi-reason response). While the results obtained by the

---

[1]The reader is referred to pages 50 to 61 in Chapter V for a discussion of the results obtained by using these questions.

use of this approach were interesting, they did not take into account the content of the reasons. The second approach attempted to organize the responses into patterns on the basis of their content. The individual reasons were cross-tabulated against the dimensions of ethnic identity to determine if some responses tended to be associated more with high ethnic identity. When this procedure was employed, it was discovered that for the linguistic identity dimension, there were two basic patterns of reasons for immigration. Although the use of the identity dimensions to assist in organizing the data has serious shortcomings, it was unavoidable given the present state of theory and data in this area.

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity was defined using two different approaches. These approaches produced six dimensions of ethnic identity.[2]

Approach "A". Some dimensions were determined by oblique rotation factor analysis of a modified version of Driedger's (1975) scale. Driedger's scale was used because he uncovered many dimensions of ethnic identity, a finding which is consistent with the wide-ranging focus of this

---

[2]Approach "A" produced four dimensions of ethnic identity and involved a factor analysis of scale items based on Driedger's (1975:155) scale of ethnic identity. Approach "B" involved the use of responses from two single-item questions, one measuring self-ethnic identification; and the other measuring citizenship hesitation.

exploratory study. The dimensions he uncovered were: parochial education, religion, endogamy, language, organizations, and friends. Modification made to the items prior to the collection of the data included slight changes in wording necessitated by the unique situation of the Edmonton German sample, the deletion of four items measuring attitudes to parochial education (necessitated by the fact that for this sample, there were no parochial schools), and the deletion of two of the four items measuring attitudes to German organizations. It is here argued that the two items excluded from this study measured the degree of the respondent's knowledge about rather than his attitudes toward ethnic organizations. Recent findings (O'Bryan et al.:1975) have shown that the salience of ethnic organizations seems to be low for most individuals, and some investigators have argued that the role played by such factors has been overrated. Thus, the exclusion of two of Driedger's items concerning organizations is justifiable on both methodological and empirical grounds.

For the initial factor analysis, 18 (out of Driedger's 24) items were included. Chapter IV will provide more information on the items making up the dimensions employed by this research.[3]

---

[3]The reader is referred to Appendix B, questions: 38-1, 38-5, 38-9, 38-13, and 38-17, for examples of items comprising the language, religion, endogamy, friends, and the organizations dimensions employed by this research.

Each of these items was structured into a four-point Likert scale with a fifth-point category employed for those who could not answer the question. Since this was the case for only one respondent and since he was excluded from the analysis, the four-point scale was the one which was eventually used. The use of the Likert scale requires that the direction of the intensity of the attitudes be consistent. Since Driedger's scales included some items which had been reversed to prevent the respondents from developing response sets, the relevant items were converted after the interviews in order to maintain a uniform direction of intensity of the agreement-disagreement scale. The results of this coding procedure were then factor analyzed.

Using the obtained factor score coefficients, a factor score for each respondent on each of the four factors was obtained by the use of the following general equation presented as an option available in the factor analysis subroutine in Nie et al., The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS):1975:

$$\text{Factor Score}_{(\text{factor 1})} = \text{Facscore coefficient}_1 ((\text{item}_1\text{score}) - \text{Mean}_{\text{item}_1} + \text{Standard Deviation}_{\text{item}_1}) + \ldots \text{Facscore coefficient}_n ((\text{item}_n\text{score}) - \text{Mean}_{\text{item}_n} + \text{Standard deviation}_{\text{item}_n})$$

Because the primary statistical method employed by this research was the cross-tabulation analysis and because it was anticipated that most of the variables to be used in the analyses would be nominal level data, the respondents' standardized factor scores were converted into dichotomous variables by defining scores from -3 to 0 as low, and those between 0 and +3 as high. Thus, each respondent was categorized as either high or low on each of the four factors.

Approach "B". Self-ethnic identification was determined by a process which allowed the respondent to give consideration to each type of self-ethnic identification before choosing the one which best described him (question 39 in Appendix B). The respondents were told that the question was often a difficult one for people to answer since it asked them to describe how others felt, and they were told to feel free to take as much time in answering the question as they required. The question was then read to them in the form shown in the Interview Schedule.

After providing answers for each type of self-ethnic identity, the respondents were asked to state the one which best described them. Those who identified with the "Canadian of German background" or "Canadian-only" categories were viewed as one type--'more-Canadian-emphasis'--and those who identified with the "German-Canadian" or "German only" categories were viewed as representing a second type--'more-German-emphasis.'

Attitudes toward Canadian citizenship were determined by a measure of citizenship "hesitation." Hesitation was determined by the number of years taken to receive citizenship. Of those who received their citizenship, 36 received it within 6 years from the date of arrival in Canada, while the remaining 34 took from 7 to 27 years to apply for it. 'No hesitation' was defined so as to include those who took 6 or fewer years to obtain the citizenship (one year of grace was allowed for 'red tape'); and, 'hesitators' were defined as those who took seven or more years to become Canadian citizens.

Table 1 shows the percent and frequency distribution obtained for each of the dimensions of ethnic identity.

Socio-demographic Variables

Socio-demographic variables were introduced into the investigation of the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity to elaborate the conditions under which associations between variables were maintained or modified to protect against the possibility of mistaking a 'spurious' association for a 'real' one.

The socio-demographic variables considered here may be conceptualized for interpretive convenience as two different 'blocks' of variables. The German-block includes those variables specific to the German environment which had been discovered to be significantly related to some, or

Table 1

Percent and Frequency Distribution for Each Dimension of Ethnic Identity

Types of Ethnic I.D.		Percent	Frequency
#1. Ethnic self-identification	More Canadian Emphasis	72.1	44
	More German Emphasis	27.9	17
	Missing		17
#2. Endogamy	High	46.8	36
	Low	53.2	41
	Missing		1
#3. Religious	High	50.6	39
	Low	49.4	38
	Missing		1
#4. Linguistic	High	50.6	39
	Low	49.4	38
	Missing		1
#5. Lack of close outgroup friends	High	50.6	39
	Low	49.4	38
	Missing		1
#6. Citizenship hesitation	No	51.4	36
	Yes	48.6	34
	Missing		8

at least one, of the ethnic identity dimensions. They differentiated between the respondents at the time of immigration. The Canadian-block of variables were those which turned out to be significantly related to at least one dimension of ethnic identity. These variables are specific to the Canadian environment, differentiating between the respondents in terms of current characteristics.

The following is a description of the German- and Canadian-block variables. The German-block variables included the following: type of German background (Volksdeutsche or Reichsdeutsche), the financial situation in Germany (self-reported), the degree of satisfaction with life in Germany (self-reported), the marital status at the time of immigration, the period of immigration, and the size of the respondent's birthplace. The Canadian-block variables included measures of socio-economic status: education, income, and occupation. Each of these sets of variables will be discussed in turn.

The German-block. Although a sample of only forty was initially planned, field investigation revealed that the Edmonton German community tended to structure itself with respect to ethnic identity commitment into two types of Germans--Volksdeutsche and Reichsdeutsche. Consequently, the sample size was doubled in order to obtain equal representation of these two types of Germans. Inclusion of the

Volksdeutsche was considered particularly important because of the resemblance between the background situations of this group and the Ukrainians in Poland and Russia. Since it has often been argued that these conditions were responsible for the present high level of ethnic identity of the Ukrainians in Canada, it was anticipated that the Volksdeutsche would be similarly high on ethnic identity.

The Reichsdeutsche are those Germans who at the beginning of World War II were within the territorial borders of Germany and who were born of German parents. The Volksdeutsche were those who were living outside the territorial borders of Germany in countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia, or Russia, at the beginning of World War II. The Volksdeutsche are descendants of German citizens who were invited by Catherine the Great of Russia in 1774 to settle and cultivate land in her domain. These German agriculturalists (Dawson:1:1936:275) established bloc settlements which quickly became isolated German colonies.

The preservation of culture and traditions was considerable in these colonies. One respondent observed that his Volksdeutsche wife still spoke a dialect of German which, although common in Germany in 1775, was now only spoken by certain groups of Volksdeutsche. It may be argued that having territorialized themselves, and being socially, linguistically, and religiously isolated from their host countries, these people were in a position, similar to that

of the Ukrainians in Galacia and Bukovina, where their survival as a group depended upon their ability to withstand Polanization and Russification. Since they were successful in this, it seems reasonable to assume that they would have internalized the values of the preservation of German customs and converted them into traditions which would have been transportable to Canada. Thus, one might expect the Volksdeutsche to be more committed to their ethnic identity than the Reichsdeutsche.

Since there are two types of Germans in this study, it was necessary to define German ethnicity in two ways. For Reichsdeutsche, this was having a German father and having been born within the territorial borders of Germany at the outbreak of World War II. German ethnicity was considered to have been established for the Volksdeutsche, if they considered themselves to be German and if they had been born outside the borders of Germany existing in 1939. For those born within the German borders the emphasis in this study was placed on their parentage; while, for those born outside the borders, the emphasis was placed on whether or not they felt German. As one Volksdeutsche respondent pointed out: "If a pig is born in a stable, is it a pig or a horse?"

Financial situation in Germany was determined by a question which asked the respondent to state how he perceived his financial position in Germany to be relative to

other Germans at that time. Although initially these responses had been structured into four categories, they were collapsed into a dichotomy of those who perceived their financial situation as average or lower, and those who felt that their financial position was above average or wealthy. For the exact wordings for this and subsequently discussed questions, the reader is referred to the Interview Schedule in Appendix B.

Degree of satisfaction with life in Germany was originally recorded in four response categories. Because of the small sample size and the subsequent difficulties in interpreting tables with four levels of this variable, it was collapsed into two categories: satisfied (comprised of those who checked "very satisfied" and "satisfied"), and dissatisfied (comprised of those who checked "not very satisfied" and "very unhappy"). To concretize the responses to this question the respondents were asked what their specific satisfactions or dissatisfactions had been. If they changed their minds upon being further questioned, then their initial response was adjusted accordingly.

Marital status at the time of immigration was initially structured in terms of the standard types of categories for this variable. However, since only one respondent fell outside the married and single categories (being divorced), he was included in the group labelled as single when they immigrated to Canada.

Period of immigration was determined by an examination of the distribution of the years of arrival of the respondents. This distribution was positively skewed with a sharp drop occurring in 1955. Interviews with respondents revealed that economic recovery in Germany began in 1953 with the introduction of a new monetary policy which stabilized the value of German currency. It may be argued that by 1955 a new socio-economic climate prevailed in Germany which could have influenced the character of the immigration to Canada. Thus, although the division of the period of immigration variable into two categories--post-War (1949-1954) and recent (1955-1969)--is one employing unequal time intervals, it may be argued that these two periods represent two distinct contexts from which German immigrants to Canada came.

Size of birthplace was initially structured into five population sizes: less that 1,000; 1,000 to 5,000; 5,000 to 10,000; 10,000 to 25,000; and above 25,000. However, the obtained distribution was u-shaped, with most of the sample falling into the extreme size ranges. The categories were thus collapsed into two: 'more-rural' (those born in population centers of less than 25,000 people), and 'more-urban' (those born in population centers of more than 25,000).

Table 2 shows the sample distributions on the above German-block variables.

Table 2

Percent and Frequency Distribution of the German-Block Variables

Variable	Level of Variance	Percent	Frequency
1. Type of German	Volksdeutsche	47.4	37
	Reichsceutsche	52.6	41
2. Financial situation in Germany	Average of lower	81.8	63
	Above average	18.2	14
3. Satisfaction with life in Germany	Satisfied	52.6	41
	Dissatisfied	47.4	38
4. Marital status at the time of immigration	Married	30.8	24
	Single	69.2	54
5. Period of immigration	1949-1954	65.4	51
	1955-1969	47.4	37
6. Size of birthplace	More-rural	53.8	42
	More-urban	46.2	36

The Canadian-block. Education was measured in two ways. One measure of education used was based on educational attainment. This was the total number of years of formal schooling which the respondent had. This was initially structured in terms of four response categories: "6 years or less"; "7 to 9 years"; "10 to 12 years"; and "more than 12 years." These were collapsed into two categories for purposes of cross-tabulation--"12 or fewer years," and "more than 12 years." The second measure of education employed in this research related to additional education received in Canada. The responses were dichotomized on the basis of whether or not the respondent received additional schooling in Canada.

Income was originally structured into four categories: $9,999 or less; $10,000 to $19,999; $20,000 to $29,999; and $30,000 and higher. However, to reduce interpretive problems with the Chi-square statistic and because only one respondent fell into the lowest category, the lowest income earner was placed into the next highest income range, and the resulting three categories were used in the analysis. It must be noted that in each case, 'income' referred to the reported total disposable income of the head of the household from any source before taxes.

The final Canadian-block variable was occupation in Canada. This was initially listed in specific form, but since this yielded almost fifty distinct types, occupation

was dichotomized: "managers and professional" (including accountants, professors, managers of large businesses and owners of large businesses, lawyers, ministers, educators, medical doctors, engineers, and architects), and "tradesmen" (including various trades and also those small entrepreneurs whose business was based on their knowledge of a trade, plus those whose trade orbit had led them into a supervisory position).

Table 3 presents the sample distributions on the Canadian-block variables.

Data Analysis

This section describes the procedures that were employed in the investigation of the relationships basic to the study. In the interests of parsimony and coherence, this section will present a general description of the statistical procedures rather than a detailed account. The reader is referred to the next two chapters for a detailed discussion of the factor analysis procedures, and the procedures employed in the analysis of responses to reasons for immigration.

There are two basic sets of relationships investigated by this study. The first set is the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity. The study of this relationship involved, (a) the derivation of a typology of reasons for immigration (discussed in detail in Chapter V), and (b) the determination of the major dimensions of ethnic

Table 3

Percent and Frequency Distribution of the Canadian-Block Variables

	Variable	Level of Variance	Percent	Frequency
1.	Income	Low ($10-20,000)	35.9	28
		Medium ($20-30,000)	33.3	26
		High ($30,000 and up)	30.8	24
2.	Education	0-12 years	53.8	44
		More than 12 years	46.2	36
3.	Occupation	Managerial or professional	47.4	37
		Trades	52.6	41

identity by means of an oblique rotation method of factor analysis (discussed in detail in Chapter IV).[4] The other indices of ethnic identity were derived by the use of the sub-program "Frequencies."[5] As indicated in the preceding section, by means of examining the frequency distributions of those with different self-ethnic identifications, and those with different numbers of years of hesitation with respect to becoming citizens, it was possible to characterize respondents as being "more-Canadian" or "more-German" in their self-identity; and as being "hesitators" or "non-hesitators" regarding the acquisition of Canadian citizenship.

The relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity dimensions per se was investigated by the use of the sub-program "Crosstabs."[6] This program provides contingency tables and related measures of association for the investigation of relationships between 7 or fewer variables. The Chi-square test was applied to determine the statistical significance of relationships. After having determined which dimensions had been significantly related to reasons for immigration, these relationships were further

---

[4] A description of the statistical and programming procedures for oblique analysis is provided in the SPSS Manual (1975:468-514).

[5] "Frequencies" is described in the SPSS Manual (1975:181-201).

[6] "Crosstabs" is described in the SPSS Manual (1975: 218-248).

elaborated. The variables employed in the elaboration analysis included the typology of reasons for immigration, the 'German-block' and the 'Canadian-block' variables.

Summary

This chapter described the methods employed to investigate basic variables and analyze relationships central to this study. The main issues influencing the research design were discussed at the outset. The sample was described in terms of the reasons for using a purposive sample, and the implications of using this type of sample. The description of the Interview Schedule specified the timing of the study, the kinds of questions asked in the study, and the manner in which rapport was established between the respondents and the interviewer. The next section described the statistical procedures employed to explore the basic relationships of this study. The next section described three basic sets of variables considered in the study: reasons for immigration (including the development of a relevant typology), ethnic identity (six dimensions--endogamy, religion, language, friends, self-ethnic identification, and citizenship hesitation), and socio-demographic variables (two types--German context and Canadian context variables).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: ETHNIC IDENTITY[1]

This chapter presents the results of the procedures used to derive the dimensions of ethnic identity. The results of the factor analytic approach are presented first, and this is followed by a description of the results of using the single-questions approach.

Results of Factor Analysis

Factor analysis of a modified version of Driedger's (1975) scale produced a four-dimensional measure of ethnic identity. These four dimensions were obtained after a two-step procedure similar to that employed by Driedger was applied to determine which items were to be included. On the basis of a stop criterion of an eigenvalue of unity, five factors were obtained. Also, on the basis of the magnitude of the communality estimates obtained after reaching the stop criterion; and, on the basis of their having loaded above .40, the number of items to be used in the subsequent factor analysis reduced to 11 from 18.

---

[1]A number of variables were included in this research in an attempt to probe the influence of war guilt on attitudes to ethnic identity. These questions are shown in Appendix B as questions 30-33 inclusive. This research was unable to find any influences on ethnic identity which could be attributed to war guilt as measured by the questions which had been included in this research.

The factor analysis of these eleven items revealed four factors. Table 4 shows the factor structure obtained.

The principal factor was endogamy--comprised of two items measuring attitudes to ingroup marriage, and one item each measuring attitudes to ingroup friends and ingroup dating. This factor accounted for 25.4% of the explained variance. The second factor accounted for 19.8% of the explained variance and was comprised of three items measuring attitudes to religion. It was labelled the "religious identity" factor. The third factor was labelled the "linguistic identity" factor; and, it accounted for 15.4% of the explained variance. It was composed of two items which measured attitudes to the retention of language. The fourth factor was labelled the friends factor and it accounted for 10.7% of the explained variance. It was composed of three items measuring attitudes to outgroup friends and one item measuring the respondent's attitudes to crossgroup dating. The four factors together accounted for 71.3% of the explained variance in the 11 items.[2]

Oblique, rather than orthogonal, rotation was employed because it was considered to be an empirically more realistic approach. The after-the-fact wisdom of using oblique rotation rather than orthogonal rotation was established by an examination of the factor intercorrelations. That is, the use of

---

[2]For a list of the exact wording of the questions making up the significantly loading items for each factor, the reader is referred to Appendix C.

Table 4

The Factor Structure of Ethnic Identity

Items	Factors				h^2
	Endogamy	Religion	Language	Friends	
The need to learn German	-.09	-.12	.73	.09	.34
The importance of speaking German in the home	.10	.10	.70	.09	.35
Religion is a source of strength	.16	.83	-.14	.05	.59
The importance of attending Church	.17	.50	.19	.09	.25
God's significance in daily life	.14	.85	-.05	.19	.60
The importance of ingroup dating	.66	.22	.04	.01	.41
The importance of ingroup marriage	.77	.23	-.08	.25	.50
No crossgroup marriage	.67	.07	-.24	.46	.54
The importance of ingroup friends	.62	-.01	.21	.35	.40
The lack of outgroup friends	.18	-.12	.12	.59	.34
Attitude to the prevention of outgroup friends	.30	-.09	-.16	.92	.52
Percentage of variance explained by each factor	25.4%	19.8%	15.4%	10.7%	

Total Explained variance - 71.3%

orthogonal factor analysis requires the assumption of independent factors, and since the factors were correlated, the analysis required the use of the oblique technique. Table 5 presents the intercorrelation matrix of the factors.

Table 5 shows that endogamy was positively associated with both religion and ingroup friends, and that there was a negative and nearly significant statistical relationship between religion and the ingroup friends factors.

Hindsight revealed that many of the items which had been excluded from this analysis because of their low loadings had been perceived as ambiguous by the Edmonton respondents. For example: "Being a member of the German group and religion is something I acknowledge because of my birth, but I do not feel it important enough to actively participate in" was clearly ambiguous, since being a member of "the German group" is not the same as belonging to the 'German religion.' Another, although perhaps less obvious example of ambiguity in wording, is: "It is embarrassing for me to see Germans speaking German in a mixed group." Many respondents were uncertain about whether they were being asked about their feelings about 'the German language'; or, the politeness of using German in a social situation in which some of the listeners might not be able to understand German.

When the items excluded by this research were compared for their loadings on Driedger's factors found for his Winnipeg sample, it was discovered that with one exception,

Table 5

Factor Intercorrelations

	Endogamy	Religion	Language	Friends
Endogamy	--	.21	.02	.28
Religion	--	--	-.01	-.17
Language	--	--	--	-.02
Friends	--	--	--	--

N = 77

these items had the lowest of his significant loadings. While this may have been the result of the different attitudes brought to bear on these dimensions by the different samples, it may also have been the result of the greater sensitivity to ambiguous wordings of the smaller sample employed in this research. Thus, the present study may have a 'purer' measure of the ethnic identity dimensions, uncluttered by ambiguous items; or it may not, depending upon whether it was the ambiguity of the items or the different samples which may explain the differences in significant loadings.

The Single-Question Approach: Self-Ethnic Identity and Citizenship Hesitancy

Self-ethnic identification among this sample appeared to favor the "more-Canadian" emphasis: 56.4% of the respondents felt that the "more-Canadian" response categories best described them, and a further 21.8% did not know how their self-ethnic identification could best be described.

The sixth and final dimension of ethnic identity employed by this research was citizenship hesitation. The sample was fairly evenly divided between the two levels of this variable: 48.6% of the sample were classified as "hesitators," and 51.4% were classified as "non-hesitators."

Summary

The factor analytic and single-question procedures resulted in six dimensions of ethnic identity. These were: endogamy, religion, language, friends, self-ethnic

identification, and citizenship hesitation. These dimensions will be used as dependent variables in the following exploration of the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity dimensions.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: REASONS FOR IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC IDENTITY

This chapter is divided into two main sections. Responses to the questions on reasons for immigration will be discussed in the first section to clarify the bases for the development of a typology of reasons for immigration. The second part of the chapter will examine the relationship between reasons for immigration and the previously described dimensions of ethnic identity.

Toward a Typology of Reasons for Immigration

Reasons for immigration were investigated by asking a lead-in question, and then following the responses obtained by this question, with a question which asked the respondent to give a more detailed response.

The Lead-In or Unprobed Question

This question was designed to prepare the respondent for a further probe in the same area. The respondents were asked to state when they had first thought of immigrating to Canada, and what it was which had made them think of Canada at that time. It was interesting to observe that the responses obtained by this lead-in question appeared to have been similar to those obtained by previous research in the

area of individual-level studies of reasons for immigration (Richmond:1974; Anderson:1974). That is, exactly 51% of the respondents gave the influence of relatives or friends in Canada as their initial reason for thinking of immigrating; 14% gave the expectation of better employment opportunities; 12% stated that they had been pushed away from Germany because of deprivation conditions; another 12% stated that they had been pulled to Canada by the perceived more attractive style of life here; 8% immigrated because of the social stimulus of other immigrants; and 4% stated that they had first thought of immigrating because of travel and adventure reasons. Table 6 shows these reasons and their associated percentages and frequency distributions.

The Probed Question

Table 7 shows the response categories obtained by inspecting the answers to the question: Why did you immigrate to Canada?

The review of the literature and the pilot interviews conducted prior to the finalization of the format of the Interview Schedule had suggested that when probed, it would be possible to distinguish two types of responses concerning reasons for immigration: the mono-reason response and the multi-reason response. Table 7 shows the distribution of the respondents by these two types of responses. It will be observed that about one-half of the respondents were

Table 6

Unprobed Reasons for Immigration: Percent and Frequency Distributions

Reason	Percent	Frequency
Relatives or friends in Canada	51.0	40
Employment opportunities	14.0	11
Deprivations in Germany	12.0	9
Attractive style of life in Canada	12.0	9
Social movement stimulis	8.0	6
Travel and adventure	4.0	3

N = 78

Table 7

Probed Reasons for Immigration: Percent and Frequency Distributions

Reasons	Percent	Frequency
Better elsewhere	37.2	29
Instability and better elsewhere	24.3	19
Loss, instability, and better elsewhere	14.1	11
Loss, and better elsewhere	9.0	7
Career	9.0	7
Loss and instability	2.3	2
Instability	2.3	2
Loss or dispossession	1.3	1

N = 78

prompted to immigrate to Canada by one of the following reasons: (a) belief that it was better elsewhere than in Germany, (b) career opportunities, (c) perception of instability in Germany, and (d) loss or dispossession resulting from World War II. The respondents who gave the "better-elsewhere" response immigrated because they expected the conditions in Canada to be more "attractive" than those in Germany. In these cases, attractive referred to less overcrowding, a more vigorous economy, and a less war-torn environment. The "career" response included those respondents who immigrated because they believed it would be advantageous for their careers. The respondents who gave the "fear-of-instability" response immigrated because of fears over the possibility of yet another war, a concern with the lack of personal freedom in Germany, and/or a concern with the political instability of Germany. Those who gave the "loss or dispossession" response had been dispossessed of their lands, other property, or close friends or relatives as a result of the war. Any combination of these reasons was treated as a multi-reason response. About one-half of the sample gave multiple reasons for immigration.

The above categories of reasons for immigration were cross-tabulated with the dimensions of ethnic identity. A significant relationship was found only for linguistic identity: 66.7% of those who gave single-reason responses were high on linguistic identity, while only 34.2% of those

who gave multi-reason responses were equally high on linguistic identity (Chi-square = 6.9, df = 1, p = .009). Further analysis revealed that only the occupation-in-Germany variable had been significantly related to reasons for immigration (and almost significantly related to linguistic identity): 27.3% of those in the managerial and professional category, compared to 65.8% of those in the trades category, gave a single-reason response (Chi-square = 3.7, df = 1, p = .05); and 27.3% of those in the managerial and professional, compared to 62.3% of those in the trades category, were high on linguistic identity (Chi-square = 2.87, df = 1, p = .09).

Occupation in Germany was used as a control variable to examine further the relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity. However, because of the small number of respondents in the managerial and professional occupation group, it was not possible to determine the effect of this level of the control variable on the original relationship. The relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity was maintained for those whose occupation in Germany came under the trades category.[1]

---

[1]It could be argued that the relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity was due to the different education levels of the respondents. Those with higher education would tend, perhaps, to give more complex, and hence, multi-reasons; while those with less education would perhaps give mono-reasons. However, this

The finding that the mono-reason responses tended to be associated with high linguistic identity and that the multi-reason responses tended to be associated with low linguistic identity may be interpreted by reference to common sense. That is, those who gave more than one reason were probably more anxious to leave than those who gave only one reason. Thus, one would expect the respondents who were motivated by a multiplicity of reasons (multi-reason type) to show less interest in maintaining their ethnic identities (as expressed through attitudes to this language dimension of ethnic identity) than those who gave only one reason.

While the typology of reasons for immigration based on the quantity of reasons given has face validity, it is likely that a typology which used the content of the reasons would provide more explanatory power. However, because of the poverty of theory and data in the area of reasons for immigration research, it was difficult to uncover content themes around which the probed reason responses could be organized.

Inspection of Table 7 revealed that there were no self-evident patterns to the different types of responses obtained by probing of the question on reasons for immigration. Nor did a more complete description of the events contained within each one of the probed reasons help to organize the

---

was not the case. A statistically significant relationship between reasons for immigration and educational attainment was not found.

individual responses. The basic types of reasons given were the four types of single-reason responses: expectation of conditions being "better elsewhere," pursuit of the "career" orbit, the "fear of instability," and "loss or dispossession." However, organization of all of the responses into these four types was not possible because many respondents gave combinations of these types of reasons.

Since this preliminary examination did not reveal noteworthy patterns to the reasons given, an alternative approach was used to develop a typology of reasons based on the content of the reasons which involved examination of the distribution of these reasons on the ethnic identity dimensions. It was reasoned that if reasons for immigration and ethnic identity were related, then certain of the probed reasons would be associated with high ethnic identity, while others would be associated with low ethnic identity. Thus, the 8 probed response types shown in Table 7 were cross-tabulated with six dimensions of ethnic identity.

Only for the case of the linguistic identity dimension was it possible to discern a pattern to the reasons given for immigration. Table 8 shows the results of this cross-tabulation. Some reasons tended to be associated with high linguistic identity, and others with low linguistic identity.

Unfortunately, some of the frequencies in Table 8, particularly those associated with the categories of

Table 8

Probed Reasons for Immigration by High Linguistic Identity

Reason	Percent	Frequency
Instability	100	2
Better elsewhere	72.4	21
Loss and better elsewhere	71.4	5
Loss and instability	50.0	1
Career	42.9	3
Instability and better elsewhere	27.8	5
Loss, instability, and better elsewhere	18.2	5
Loss or dispossession	0.0	0

"instability," "loss and instability," and "career," are too small to warrant any generalizations. Thus the percentages associated with these three categories, though high, may be discounted. Further examination of Table 8 shows that two groups of respondents are very high on linguistic identity: those whose answers were classified under "better elsewhere," and those whose answers were classified under "loss and better elsewhere." In contrast, two groups of respondents are low on linguistic identity; these respondents come under the categories of "instability and better elsewhere" and "loss, instability and better elsewhere." (None of the respondents who come under the category of "loss or dispossession" are high on linguistic identity.) These results strongly suggest the existence of two important types of reasons for immigration: one involving the themes of "fear-of-instability," while the other involving the theme of "better elsewhere" (with no reference whatsoever to instability). The former type is associated with low linguistic identity, while the latter is associated with high linguistic identity.

However, this typology does not incorporate or explain for the wide range of responses encountered in the study, particularly those under the categories of "career," "loss," and "instability." Indeed, the careerists may represent an altogether different type of respondent. Had a sufficient number of this type been obtained, it would have been differentiated as a third type. However, since only 7

respondents gave the career response, and since the cross-tabulations with this frequency would be impossible to interpret, the respondents who gave the career response were excluded from the calculations involving the reasons for immigration variable. The same difficulties are associated with the category of "loss or dispossession."

It proved difficult to explain the high linguistic identity of the two respondents who gave the "instability" response (Table 8), particularly in view of the fact that the fear-of-instability pattern respondents tended to be low on linguistic identity. The two cases in question may have been the result of the operation of chance factors. Had more cases come under the category of "instability," it is possible that such respondents would have tended to show similar linguistic identity intensities (low) as those whose responses reflected "fear-of-instability." This research assumed that chance factors were operative, and the instability responses were thus included within the fear-of-instability pattern of responses, in spite of the apparent differences in linguistic identity intensity.

Thus, the two seemingly important response patterns revealed in this study were: the better-elsewhere pattern (composed of the "better-elsewhere" response, plus the "loss and better elsewhere" combination response); and the fear-of-instability pattern (composed of the "loss, instability, and better elsewhere" combination response, plus

the "instability and better elsewhere" combination response, plus the "loss and instability" combination response, plus the "instability" response).

To further investigate the appropriateness of this typology, the individual responses obtained by the probing of the question on reasons for immigration were cross-tabulated with the occupation-in-Germany variable. Inspection of Table 9 shows that the derived typology appeared to differentiate between occupation types. Thus, 72.8% of the respondents who had been categorized as managers and professionals gave reasons which were part of the "fear-of-instability" pattern; while only 34.4% of the tradesmen gave similar kinds of reasons.

The Relationship Between Reasons for Immigration and Ethnic Identity

The "better elsewhere" and the "fear-of-instability" patterns of reasons appeared to be similar to Eisenstadt's formulation of the motives for emigration (1954:2). Specifically, if Eisenstadt's 'instrumental' and 'facilities for adaptation' spheres of motivations for immigration (in which the cause of the emigration is considered to be frustration due to blockage in these spheres) were combined, then the category of 'better elsewhere' would appear to be congruent with this combined categorization. For, among those who gave the "better elsewhere" response pattern, the emphasis for the immigration was placed on the lack of

Table 9

Occupation in Germany by the Probed Reasons for Immigration

Reasons	Occupation in Germany	
	Manager or Professional	Trades
Loss, instability, better elsewhere	--	13.2*
Better elsewhere	--	57.9
Loss and better elsewhere	--	5.3
Instability and better elsewhere	54.6*	15.8*
Loss and instability	18.2*	--
Instability	--	5.3*
Career	27.3	2.6

*Responses which were part of the fear-of-instability pattern

opportunities, and the lack of economic and social attractiveness of life in Germany, compared to the opposite conditions which were perceived to exist in Canada. Similarly, a combination of Eisenstadt's 'worthwhile pattern of life' and 'aspirations to solidarity' spheres of motivations (in which the cause of the emigration was again considered to be the result of frustrations caused by blockages in these spheres) appeared to be congruent with the "fear-of-instability" pattern of reasons for immigration. Those who gave this response pattern were concerned over the threat of another war in Germany, with the lack of personal freedom, with the political instability of Germany--in short, they had been concerned with the absence of a shared and stable value system with which they could identify in Germany.

The significance of the derived typology to that proposed by Eisenstadt lies in the explanatory power of Eisenstadt's formulation for later behavior in the Canadian context. That is, if those respondents who gave the "fear-of-instability" response were looking for new sets of values with which to identify, then they would be predisposed to change upon arrival in Canada. On the other hand, if those giving the "better elsewhere" reasons were looking for alternative routes to reach goals which had been frustrated in Germany, then they may not be predisposed to change in the Canadian setting, to the same degree. Eisenstadt (1954:4) has argued that:

> . . . the analysis of the immigrants' motives for immigration and consequent 'image' of the new country is not of historical interest alone, but is also of crucial importance for understanding his initial attitudes and behaviors in his new setting. It is this initial motivation that . . . decides the immigrants' orientation and degree of readiness to accept change (1954:4).

Thus, the investigation of the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity attitudes in Canada makes it possible to examine ethnic identity as a complex process with its origin in dispositions arising out of forces in the country of emigration, and with its ongoing development being shaped by forces in the country of immigration. It will be interesting to explore the relationship between the two response patterns of reasons for immigration, and the strength in Canada of the immigrants' attitudes on the dimensions of ethnic identity employed by this research.

Reasons for Immigration and Linguistic Identity

As one would expect, given the manner in which the typology of reasons for immigration had been derived, a clear relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity was found: only 30.3% of those giving the "fear-of-instability" pattern of reasons were high on linguistic identity (Chi-square = 10.5, df = 1, p = .001, eta^2 = .176). This finding may be interpreted in terms of Eisenstadt's model. That is, those who had been concerned with the stability of Germany had found German values inadequate for their needs. They were thus impelled to

Canada to search for other values. This probably explains why the respondents who were classified under "fear-of-instability" tended to have low linguistic identities since their search for new values implied readiness to change their old orientations (e.g., attachment to the German language). On the other hand, it may be argued that those who had appraised the situation more instrumentally had been induced to depart by the pull of alternative routes in Canada for the accomplishment of their goals. This departure would not necessarily entail negative valence to German language and culture. Consequently, the respondents who immigrated to Canada because they believed it was "better-elsewhere" had higher linguistic identities than those giving the "fear-of-instability" pattern of reasons.

Having found and interpreted the relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity as asymmetric (reasons for immigration was considered to have been a determinant of linguistic identity), test factors were introduced to elaborate the relationship.[2]

Educational attainment was significantly related to linguistic identity: 73.8% of those with less than or equal to 12 years of schooling were high on linguistic identity,

---

[2]The search for such test factors is simplified by the fact that in order to qualify as a test factor a variable must be both logically and statistically related to both the dependent and independent variables (Rosenberg: 1968). For this relationship, only educational attainment qualified.

while this was true for only 22.9% of those who had taken more than 12 years of schooling (Chi-square = 17.8, df = 1, p = .0000, n = 77, eta^2 = .26). Thus, among this German sample the greater familiarity with the cultural symbols of those with higher education did not result in more favorable attitudes to the German language.

Educational attainment was also related to reasons for immigration: only 44.1% of those giving the "fear-of-instability" pattern of reasons, compared to 75% of those giving the "better-elsewhere" pattern, were in the lower education group (Chi-square = 5.7, df = 1, n = 70, p = .02).

How much of the relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity was a result of these two variables sharing association with educational attainment? The answer to this question was obtained by controlling the original relationship for each level of educational attainment. Table 10 presents the results of this cross-tabulation.

Table 10 shows that the relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity was conditional upon membership in the lowest educational group. For the higher education group there was little difference in kinds of linguistic identity between those who gave different patterns of reasons for immigration. Thus, one may argue that the high education level intervened in the relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity, influencing the development of lower linguistic identity among respondents.

Table 10

Probed Reasons for Immigration by Linguistic Identity Controlled for the Effects of Educational Attainment

Reasons for Immigration	High Linguistic Identity			
	Less than 13 years*		More than 12 years**	
	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
Instability	46.7	15	16.7	18
Better elsewhere	88.7	27	22.2	9

*p = .009; N = 42

**p = .86; N = 27

Reasons for Immigration and Endogamous Identity

The relationship between reasons for immigration and endogamous identity was not significant, but it was in the direction that one would expect on the basis of Eisenstadt's model.[3] Approximately 39.4% of the respondents falling under the category of the "fear-of-instability" were high on endogamy, compared to 50% of those giving the "better-elsewhere" type of reasons being equally high on endogamy. Thus, the respondent who gave the "fear-of-instability" response would be looking for new associations and would likely be lower on endogamous identity than his counterpart who gave the "better-elsewhere" response. The latter's adaptive and instrumental goals would not be expected to exclude attitudes favoring endogamy.

However, it is possible that the marital status variable may have suppressed the relationship between reasons for immigration and endogamy. One would expect single persons to have different attitudes toward potential marriage partners and also to have different reasons for immigrating from those who were married at the time of immigration. Married people would be more likely to be raising families;

---

[3]Although the relationship appeared to be insignificant, Rosenberg cautions that much theory has been prematurely abandoned because the investigator failed to test for variables which might be suppressing a real association between the variables. There are a number of variables which might suppress a relationship between reasons for immigration and endogamous identity. One of these is the marital status at the time of immigration.

and they would be more likely to favor German females, if for no other reason than the fact that they are probably already married to one. Thus, among those who were married when they immigrated one would expect the respondents who gave the "fear-of-instability" response to be high on endogamy, while those giving the "better-elsewhere" pattern of response to be low on endogamous identity. However, for single individuals one might anticipate that the original arguments about the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity dimensions would apply. That is, if the respondents had left Germany because they were concerned over the lack of stability of the country and its values, then one would expect them to be low on endogamous identity in Canada (because they would be predisposed toward a change of values). If, on the other hand, they had a non-negative valence to Germany expressed in terms of their having given the "better-elsewhere" pattern of response, then one would expect them to favorable to German culture and to German females. Thus, the lack of association between reasons for immigration and endogamous identity may have been the result of the two categories of marital status which cancelled one another out, and thus suppressed the relationship.

Table 11 shows that when controlled for each level of the marital status variable, the statistical relationship between reasons for immigration and endogamous identity was significant; and the direction of the relationships in the

Table 11

Probed Reasons for Immigration by Endogamy Controlled for the Effects of Marital Status-at-the-Time-of-Immigration

Reasons for Immigration	High Endogamy			
	Married*		Single**	
	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
Instability	43.8	13	30.0	20
Better elsewhere	0.0	6	60.0	30

*p = .03; N = 19

**p = .07; N = 50

contingent associations was consistent with what one would expect on the basis of Eisenstadt's model.

Of those married respondents whose reason for immigration was "fear-of-instability," 53% had high endogamous identities, while none of the married respondents who were motivated to immigrate by better conditions elsewhere had high endogamous identities. On the other hand, among those who were single at the time of immigration, the reverse was true: 30% of the single respondents who gave a "fear-of-instability" response, and 60% of those who gave the "better-elsewhere" response, had high endogamous identities. Thus, marital status at the time of immigration suppressed the relationship between reasons for immigration and endogamous identity.

Table 12 shows that only 29.4% of the Volksdeutsche respondents who had given the "fear-of-instability" response had high endogamous identities, compared to 68.4% of the Volksdeutsche who had given the "better-elsewhere" response pattern being equally high on endogamous identity. For the Reichsdeutsche, no statistically significant differences in the level of endogamous identity between those who had given the different response patterns of reasons for immigration was found.

Although it was not statistically significant, the relationship between reasons for immigration and endogamous identity among the Reichsdeutsche was in the opposite direction

Table 12

Probed Reasons for Immigration by Endogamy Controlled for the Different Types of German Background

Reasons for Immigration	High Endogamy			
	Volksdeutsche*		Reichsdeutsche**	
	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
Fear-of-instability	29.4	17	50.0	16
Better elsewhere	68.4	19	29.0	17

*p = .04; N = 36

**p = .39; N = 33

from that found among the Volksdeutsche. This raises the question of how the different types of German background effected the three-variable relationship involving reasons for immigration, endogamy, and marital status before immigration. Table 13 shows the results of this three-variable relationship controlled for the effects of the two types of German background.

Because of the small N's involved, it was not possible to evaluate the factor of German background for those who had been married prior to immigration. However, the four-way cross-tabulation appeared to have purified the relationship between reasons for immigration, endogamy, and being single prior to immigration. That is, the withdrawal of the single Reichsdeutsche who appeared to have had opposite tendencies with respect to endogamous identity from the Volksdeutsche, intensified the original relationships. Thus, 38% of the variance in endogamous identity was explained by the reasons for immigration variables ($eta^2 = .38$).

Reasons for Immigration and Citizenship Hesitation

Although statistically not significant, reasons for immigration and the number of years of hesitation with respect to citizenship showed some degree of association: 58.1% of those who gave the "better-elsewhere" response and only 41.2% of those who gave the "fear-of-instability" pattern of response hesitated (Chi-square = 1.2, df = 1, $p = .27$, $n = 65$). This finding is what one would expect on

Table 13

Probed Reasons for Immigration by Endogamy by Marital Status Prior to Immigration, Controlled for the Effects of the Different Types of German Background

Reason for Immigration	Married				Single			
	Volksdeutsche[a]		Reichsdeutsche[b]		Volksdeutsche[c]		Reichsdeutsche[d]	
	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
Fear-of-instability	100.0	3	40.0	10	14.3	14	66.7	6
Better-elsewhere	0.0	2	0.0	4	76.5	17	38.5	13

[a] $p = .10$; $N = 5$ [b] $p = .21$; $N = 14$ [c] $p = .002$; $N = 31$ [d] $p = .26$; $N = 19$

the basis of Eisenstadt's model, since those who were disposed to change (the "fear-of-instability" respondents) would likely become Canadian citizens more rapidly than those who had been less inclined to change their cultural orientations (the "better-elsewhere" respondents).

Discussion

Given a multi-dimensional conception of ethnic identity, it is reasonable to assume that different dimensions would be determined by different initial conditions. Thus, it was not in principle surprising that reasons for immigration were found to be significantly related to endogamy and linguistic identity (and closely, although not significantly, related to citizenship hesitation); but, not to the other dimensions. However, this finding raises the question of what it was which the endogamy and linguistic identity dimensions had in common, aside from both being dimensions of ethnic identity, which explained their significant association with reasons for immigration; and, the further question of what it was which the other dimensions had in common which explained their statistical non-association with reasons for immigration.

It may be observed that reasons for immigration were conditionally related to both the language and the endogamous identity factors. It was primarily among those Volksdeutsche who had been single that reasons for immigration had been

related to endogamous identity; and, it was only among those with less than or equal to 12 years of schooling that reasons for immigration and linguistic identity had been related. One could argue that for those who were single, endogamous identity would have been a critical issue upon arrival in Canada, since their single status may have been a lonely situation. Similarly, for those with low levels of education who probably were not familiar with the English language, language would have been a critical factor upon arrival in Canada. Thus, it is possible that what these two dimensions of ethnic identity had in common was their critical immediacy in the Canadian setting.

One may develop the hypothesis that this critical immediacy led to an intensification of the original polarization of attitudes to German culture which had been expressed through the original pattern of reasons given for immigrating. If they had given the "fear-of-instability" response, then they were presumably 'dissociated-from-the-core' and/or blocked in their 'aspirations in the solidarity,' and 'worthwhile pattern of life' spheres. Thus one would expect them to show low language and endogamous identities, particularly if they had encountered difficulties in the Canadian situation which were the product of differences due to cultural heritage. However, if they came to Canada because it appeared to be a sensible move given their ambitions, then they would not be expected to have been

'dissociated-from-the-core,' and one would expect this group to have shown more positive attitudes toward German language and endogamous identity, regardless of the situation faced in Canada. Thus, it may be argued that it was the critical immediacy of the situation faced in Canada which the language and endogamous identity factors had in common; and which, depending upon the reasons for immigration, tended to exaggerate or reduce the previous attitudes held toward these two dimensions of ethnic identity.

Although not significant, the finding that citizenship hesitation was determined in part by reasons for immigration lends further support to this argument concerning critical immediacy. That is, becoming a Canadian citizen does force one to declare one's stand toward the 'old' and the 'new' countries and cultures. One would expect, therefore, that this situation would show the "fear-of-instability" respondents as the non-hesitators, and the "better-elsewhere" respondents as the hesitators.

It may be argued that in contrast to the linguistic and endogamous identity, the factors of religion, and self-ethnic identification did not present the immigrant with an immediate problem in Canada. Religious preference is a matter of personal choice and a mostly private affair. Furthermore, religious institutions are portable and are therefore more likely to buffer the immigrants from the surrounding culture than to force them to take a stand toward

it. Similarly, self-ethnic identification as 'more-German' or 'more-Canadian' could only have been an issue for these respondents if citizenship had been made compulsory after an initial residence period. Since this was not the case, then neither of these dimensions forced the respondent to take a stand toward his own country and culture. This may partly explain why reasons for immigration was not related to these dimensions.

One might expect that the tendency to maintain in-group close friends would have reflected behavior styles adopted to the condition of loneliness (similar to the hypothesis which we used to explain the endogamous identity and reasons for immigration findings) and that this dimension would be related to the differential attitudes to Germany which we believe to be expressed in the different reasons for immigration. However, many of the respondents volunteered an explanation of their <u>self-perceived</u> tendency to have more German than Canadian close friends. They explained that upon arrival in Canada the first friends they had made were German since they could not speak English well. Being the first friends, they were also the longest; and being the longest, they tended to be the closest friends. Thus, reasons for immigration cannot explain the tendency to have mostly ingroup close friends.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research explored the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity. An attempt was made to develop a typology of reasons for immigration, and to relate the types identified to each of the dimensions of ethnic identity uncovered by the study. Previous research has had little success in explaining the relationship between reasons for immigration and behavior in the new environment. It was argued that this may have been the result of not having probed the reasons given for immigration. Thus, the present research employed the interview method in order to facilitate the probing of the responses.

Ethnic identity was chosen as the dependent variable for this research because it is reasonable to assume that the reasons for changing one environment for another would be related to one's identification with dimensions which have some association with the old environment; such as, ethnic identity. A series of questions developed by Driedger to measure several dimensions of ethnic identity (linguistic, endogamous, religious, and in-group friendship identity dimensions) was employed by this research. Two other

dimensions not covered by Driedger's format were also employed by this research; namely, citizenship hesitation, and self-ethnic identification.

Because there was little data and theory from which to formulate specific hypotheses, an exploratory approach was used. The study was guided by the following questions: What is the relationship between reasons for immigration and ethnic identity dimensions, and how is this relationship influenced by certain background variables which typically would be related to the independent and dependent variables?

Two approaches to typologizing the probed reasons for immigration were used. The first approach derived the typology on the basis of the quantity (i.e., number) of reasons given, while the second employed the content of the reasons as the basis for differentiating between the two types of patterns of responses.

The relationship of the quantitative typology of reasons for immigration and the six dimensions of ethnic identity uncovered by this research was investigated. A statistically significant relationship was found only for the linguistic identity dimension. Only the occupation-in-Germany variable met the statistical criterion for use as a control variable for the elaboration of this relationship, and this variable contained too few managers and professionals to make the controlling procedure interpretable for this level of the occupation-in-Germany variable. However, the original

relationship between reasons for immigration and linguistic identity did hold for the "trades" category. That is, those tradesmen who gave a mono-reason response tended to be high on linguistic identity, while those who gave a multi-reason response tended to be low on linguistic identity. Common sense would explain this finding by referring to the possibility that the people who gave many reasons for their immigration may have been much more dissatisfied with the 'old' country, and may thus want to retain less of their ethnic identities than those who gave the mono-reason responses.

A typology of reasons for immigration based on the content of these reasons was developed by cross-tabulation of the probed reasons for immigration with the dimensions of ethnic identity. This typology was comprised of two response patterns: one involved the theme of "better-elsewhere," and the other involved the theme of "fear-of-instability." If the respondents gave reasons which could be organized into the former category, then they tended to be high on linguistic identity. However, if they gave reasons which could be considered as part of the "fear-of-instability" response pattern, then they tended to be low on linguistic identity.

As a check on the applicability of these findings, the same list of probed reasons for immigration was cross-tabulated with the occupation-in-Germany variable. The

typology distinctly differentiated between the two occupational groups--managers and professionals, on the one hand and tradesmen, on the other. Since the occupation-in-Germany variable was determined independently of the reasons for immigration and of linguistic identity, then the finding that the typology developed on the basis of these two latter variables also differentiated between the occupational types suggests that this typology may have generalizability beyond the variables which were used in its derivation.

It was argued that the two patterns of reasons derived on the basis of the content of the reasons for immigration were similar to certain combined types of motives for emigration which had been developed by Eisenstadt. This similarity allowed for the interpretation of some of the findings with the aid of this model.

When the two patterns were cross-tabulated against the six ethnic identity dimensions, only linguistic and endogamous identities showed a statistically significant relationship. For both of these dimensions, the obtained relationships were found to have been conditional.

With reference to linguistic identity, the finding that the "better-elsewhere" respondents tended to have higher linguistic identities than the "fear-of-instability" respondents was interpreted by reference to Eisenstadt's model. That is, those who had left Germany because of a need for a worthwhile and sincere pattern of life, or aspirations to

solidarity, would be predisposed to change their ethnic identities in Canada. Thus, the "fear-of-instability" respondents would tend to have low linguistic identities. Those who left because of a need to find alternative routes to adaptive and instrumental goals which had been blocked in Germany need not have been as predisposed toward cultural change. Consequently, one would expect the respondents who gave the "better-elsewhere" reason for immigration to tend to have higher linguistic identities than those who gave the "fear-of-instability" response.

The finding that the relationship between the two patterns of reasons and linguistic identity was conditional upon membership in the lower education group was explained in terms of the conditions of the situation facing immigrants in Canada. Those with higher levels of education were likely to have been familiar with the English language, while those with less education were not. Thus, for the less well educated respondents, the critical immediacy of the situation they faced because of the German language would tend to polarize their attitudes toward the German language. This would not necessarily be the case for the better educated group. Thus, this explains why reasons for immigration and linguistic identity were related for the lower education group, and not for the higher education group.

For the case of the endogamy dimension of ethnic identity, a definite, but suppressed relationship existed

between reasons for immigration and endogamous identity. That is, when this relationship had been controlled for the effects of marital status prior to immigration and the different types of German backgrounds, the relationship was purified for the Volksdeutsche group. That is, single Volksdeutsche who gave the "better-elsewhere" pattern of reasons tended to be high on endogamous identity as one would expect on the basis of Eisenstadt's theory. However, if they gave the "fear-of-instability" response pattern, then they tended to be low on endogamous identity, also as one would expect on the basis of the model proposed by Eisenstadt. It was argued that the emphasis of the Volksdeutsche on traditions explained the finding that reasons for immigration and endogamous identity was related for this group, but not for the Reichsdeutsche.

A third relationship was found between reasons for immigration and citizenship hesitation, although this was not statistically significant. As would have been predicted by Eisenstadt's theory, those who gave the "better-elsewhere" pattern of responses tended to hesitate more than those who gave the "fear-of-instability" response pattern.

It was argued that the reason some ethnic identity dimensions had a statistically significant relationship with reasons for immigration while others did not, was because of the different conditions involved for the dimensions. Some ethnic identity attitudes were brought into sharp focus

by the situation in Canada, while others were not. The critical immediacy of the language issue, for example, was used to explain why reasons for immigration was found to be related to the language, but not to the religious dimension of ethnic identity.

The critical immediacy of certain dimensions may be only one of the reasons for the significant relationship between reasons for immigration and these dimensions. Other conditions, such as for example, the method used, the selected characteristics of the sample, and the restriction to only post-War immigrants, may have contributed to these results by contributing to an intensification or diminishment of attitudes to ethnic identity, or by contributing to the types of reasons given for having immigrated.

Certain other conditions which have often been considered to have influences on ethnic identity were not included by this study. That is, neither the degree of societal pluralism, the institutional completeness, nor the position of the ethnic group on the Canadian ethnic stratification ladder were controlled for by this study. Thus, even for those dimensions for which reasons for immigration were found to be related, a future study which incorporated these influences might not obtain the same significant findings.

As with other research in this field, this study has a number of limitations. Some of these derive from the

use of the interview approach and the use of retrospective questions. Unfortunately, there is a certain amount of subjectivity built into both of these issues which makes it difficult to be certain that the obtained reasons for immigration were the 'real reasons.' Other limitations derive from the characteristics of the population selected by this study. That is, the inclusion of respondents with certain age, sex, and socio-demographic characteristics may have resulted in the intensification or reduction of intensity of attitudes toward certain dimensions of ethnic identity. Another sample, using different selected characteristics, may find that the obtained levels of ethnic identities differ from those found by this research. A similar possibility exists for the reasons for immigration variable.

Another set of limitations derives from the method used to develop the typology of probed reasons for immigration. Had this typology been developed independently of the linguistic identity dimension, then one might have had more confidence in the generalizability of the typology. Furthermore, there were conceptual difficulties with this typology. The "instability" response did not correspond (in terms of the intensity of linguistic identity associated with it) to that found for the "fear-of-instability" pattern. Also, some types such as, for example, the "careerist" response, were not included within the derived typology of

reasons for immigration because of the small frequencies involved. Thus, even if the typology were empirically valid and reliable, it did not incorporate all of the possible types of reasons for immigration.

If the limitations of this research were kept in mind, then there are some lessons learned by this study which might aid future research in the area of reasons for immigration and ethnic identity. Eisenstadt's model of motives for immigration was useful for the interpretation and explanation of many of the findings of this research. The use of this model by future research may be even more valuable if the research tends to concentrate on those areas for which the present research found significant relationships.

Certain dimensions, namely, language, endogamy, and citizenship hesitation, were related to reasons for immigration. Thus, some dimensions appear to be influenced, at least in part, by conditions located in the German environment. Other dimensions, namely, friendship, religion, and self-ethnic identification, were not related to reasons for immigration. Although competing interpretations of these findings are possible, it is tempting to suggest that lack of association between reasons for immigration and certain other variables may be a result of the many different factors which tend to determine attitudes to these dimensions.

A future study which investigated reasons for immigration in terms of Eisenstadt's model, which included the degree of pluralism, stratification, and institutional completeness, and, which employed a comparative perspective for this task, may contribute to a better understanding of the manner in which multiculturism is shaped by all of these forces.

One direction which might be investigated by future research in this area is the phenomenon of return migration. Return migration rates may be predictable in terms of the initial orientations of the immigrants. If they came because they were in search of a 'worthwhile pattern of life,' then even if they encountered frustrations in these spheres they would be unlikely to return to Germany, their country of origin, because they would have had a negative valence to that country. However, if they came for 'adaptive' and 'instrumental reasons,' then one would expect them to return to their country of origin if they encountered frustration in these spheres in Canada. Thus, respondents who gave the "better-elsewhere" pattern of reason would be likely to have higher rates of return migration than the respondents who gave the "fear-of-instability" response pattern.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allyn, N. European Immigration Into Canada, 1946-1951. Stanford: Ph.D. Thesis, 1953.

Anderson, A. "Ethnic identity in Saskatchewan bloc settlements: A sociological appraisal." Paper presented to the Seventh Annual Canadian Studies Conference. University of Calgary, March, 1975.

Anderson, Grace. Networks of Contact: The Portuguese and Toronto. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Publication, 1974.

Appleyard, R. "The return movement of United Kingdom migrants from Australia." Population Studies, xv, 1962: 214-225.

_____. British Emigration to Australia. London: George Weidenfield & Nicolson, 1964.

Bar-Yosef, R. "Desocialization and resocialization: The adjustment process of immigrants." International Migration Review, 2, 1968:27-45.

Bachi, R. "A statistical analysis of the revival of Hebrew in Isreal." Scripta Hierosolymitana. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 3, 1956.

Beijer. G. "Modern patterns of international migratory movements." In Jackson (ed.), Soiciological Studies 2: Migration. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Bell, D. "Ethnicity and social change." In Glazer and Moynihan (eds.), Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975:141-174.

Buriurkiw, B. "Ethnic identification and attitudes of University students of Ukrainian descent: The University of Alberta case study." In Jaenen, C. (ed.), Slavs in Canada: Volume III. Proceedings of the Third National Conference on Canadian Slavs, 1969.

Bosnitch, S. "Canadians in the making: Political allegiance of the immigrant." In Jaenan (ed.), op. cit.

Brand, E., Ruiz, R., and Padilla, A. "Ethnic identification and preference: A review." Psychological Bulletin, 81, 1974:860-890.

Bram, J. "Change and choice in ethnic identification." Transactions of the New York Academy of Science, 28, 1965:242-248.

Breton, R. "Institutional completeness and ethnic communities and the personal relations of immigrants." American Journal of Sociology, 70, 1964:193-205.

Brody, E. (ed.). Behavior in the New Environments: Adaptations of Migrant Populations. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1969.

_____. "Migration and adaptation: The nature of the Problem." In Brody (ed.), op. cit.

Brown, L. "English migrants to New Zealand: A pilot Rorschach study." Australian Journal of Psychology, 8, 1956:106-110.

Brunswik, E. Perception and the Representative Design of Psychological Experiments. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956.

Careless, J. "Limited identities in Canada." Canadian Historical Review, 50, 1969:1-10.

Chimbos, P. "Immigrants' attitudes toward their childrens' inter-ethnic marriages in a Canadian community." International Migration Review, 5, 1971:5-17.

Christian, J., and Christian C. "Spanish language and culture in the Southwest." In Fishman et al., (eds.), Lanugage Loyalty in the United States. London: Mouton & Co., 1966.

Corbett, D. Canada's Immigration Policy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.

Cowan, Helen. British Emigration to British North America: The First 100 Years. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957, revised.

Craft, J. "Immigration, 1891-1911." Canadian Studies: A Search for Meaning. Toronto: Wiley of Canada Ltd., 1972.

Danziger, K. "The socialization of immigrant children: Part I." York University: Research Report of the Ethnic Research Programme. Institute for Behavioral Research. 1971.

Das Gupta, J. "Ethnicity, language demands and national development." Ethnicity, 1, 1974:65-72.

David, H. "Involuntary international migration: Adaptation of refugees." In Brody (ed.), op. cit.

Dawson, C. A. Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada, Vol. 7. Toronto: The Macmillan co. of Canada Ltd., 1936.

Deutsch, D. Nationalism and Social Communication. Cambridge: Technology Press of the M.I.T., 1953:Chapt. 7.

Devor, G. "Social stratification and ethnic pluralism: An overview from the perspective of psychological anthropology." Race, 13, 1972:435-460.

Driedger, L. & Peters, J. "Ethnic identity: A comparison of Mennonite and other German students." Mennonite Quarterly Review, 47, 1973(a):225-245.

_____ & Church C. "Ethnic segregation and institutional completeness: A comparison of ethnic minorities." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 11, 1974(a):30-52.

_____. "In search of cultural identity factors: A comparison of ethnic students." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12, 1975:150-162.

Duncan, K. "Irish famine immigration and the Canadian social structure." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 2, 1965:19-40.

Edwards, L. The Natural History of Revolution. New York: Russell and Russell, 1965.

Eisenstadt, S. The Absorption of Immigrants: A Comparative Study Based on the Jewish Community in Palestine and the State of Isreal. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1954.

Erikson, E. "The concept of identity in race relations: Notes and Queries." Daedalus, 95, 145-171.

Fairchild, H. Immigration: A World Movement and its American Significance. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1913.

Fishman, et al. (eds.). Language Loyalty in the United States. London: Mouton & Co., 1966.

Fried, M. "Deprivation and migration: Dilemmas of causal interpretation." In Brody (ed.), op. cit., 23-27.

Frijda, N. "Emigrants-nonemigrants." In Beijer (ed.), op. cit., 51-141.

Geismar, L. "A scale for the measurment of ethnic identification." Jewish Social Studies, 16, 1954:33-60.

Glazer, D. "Dynamics of ethnic identification." A.S.R., 23, 1958:31-40.

_____ & Moynihan D. Beyond the Melting Pot. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

_____. Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Harvard University Press, 1975.

Government of Canada. Three Years in Canada: First Report of the Longitudinal Survey on the Economic and Social Adaptation of Immigrants. Ottawa: Canadian Immigration and Population Study, 1974.

_____. "Ethnic groups by birthplace." Census of Canada, 1971:30-2.

_____. "Characteristics of persons born outside of Canada." Census of Canada, 1971:34-7.

_____. "Population: Religious denominations by ethnic groups." Census of Canada, 1971:20-2.

_____. First Annual Report of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, Ottawa, 1975.

Greenley, A. Why Can't They be Like Us? Americans' White Ethnic Groups. New York, 1971.

_____ & McCready W. "The transmission of cultural heritages: The case of the Irish and the Italians." In Glazer and Moynihan (eds.), op. cit., 209-235.

Guttentag, Marcia. "Group cohesiveness, ethnic organization, and property." Journal of Scoial Issues, 26, 1970:105-132.

Hanson, M. The Mingling of the Canadian and American People: Volume I: Historical. Completed and prepared for publication by J. Brebner, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

Hartz, L. (ed.). The Founding of New Societies. New York: Harcourt & Brace and World Inc., 1964.

Hawkins, F. Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern. Montreal: MacGill University Press, 1972.

Herskovits, M. "Education and cultural dynamics." American Journal of Sociology, 48, 737-749.

Hertzler, J. A Sociology of Language. New York: Random House, 1965:185-195.

Hochbaum, J. "Social planning for immigrant absroption." International Migration, 2, 1967:27-45.

Hollingsworth, T. Migration: A Study Based on Scottish Experiences between 1934 and 1964. Edinburgh: University of Glasgow Social and Economic Studies. Occasional Paper No. 12, Oliver and Boyd, 1970.

Horowitz, D. "Ethnic identity." In Glazer and Moynihan (eds.), Ethnicity, op. cit., 110-140.

Hrushevsky, M. A History of the Ukraine. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

Isaacs, H. "Basic group identity." Glazer and Moynihan (eds.), Ethnicity, op. cit., 29-52.

Isajiw, W. "The process of maintenance of ethnic identity." Paper presented at the International Symposium on Language and Culture in a Multi-Cultural Society. Canadian Ethnic Studies Association. Ottawa, 1971.

Jackson, J. (ed.). Op. cit.

Kaye, V. Early Ukrainian Settlements in Canada 1895-1900: Dr. Josef Oleskow's Role in the Settlement of the Canadian Northwest. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

Kloss, H. "Language rights of immigrant groups." International Migration Review, 5, 1971:250-267.

_____. "German-American language maintenance efforts." In Fishman et al. (ed.), op. cit., chapter 9.

Lazerwitz, B. "Some factors in Jewish identification." Jewish Social Studies, 15, 1960:24.

Lee, E. "A theory of migration." Demography, 3, 1966:47-56.

Leslie, P. "Role of political parties in promoting the interests of ethnic minorities." Canadian Journal of Political Science, 2, 419-433.

Levinson, B. "Yeshiva college sub-cultural scale: An experimental attempt to devise a scale of the internationalization of Jewish traditional values." Journal of Genetic Psychology, 101, 1962: 375-399.

Lieberson, S. Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1970.

Lijphart, A. "Cultural diversity and theories of political integration." Canadian Journal of Political Science, 4, 1971.

MacDonald, N. Canada: Immigration and Colonization, 1841-1903. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1966.

Madge, J. The Origins of Scientific Sociology. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Mannion, J. Irish Settlemtns in Eastern Canada: A Study of Cultural Transfer and Adaptations. Toronto: University Of Toronto Press, 1974.

Mason, O. "Migration and the food quest: A study in the peopling of America." American Anthropologist, 7, 1894: 275-292.

McDougal, D. "Immigration into Canada, 1951-1920." Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 1961.

McRae, K. "The structure of Canadian history." In Hartz (ed.), op. cit.

Migus, P. (ed.). Sounds Canadian: Languages and Cultures in Multi-Ethnic Society. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1975.

Mostwin, D. "In search of ethnic identity." Social Casework, 53, 1972:307-316.

Nagata, J. "Adaptation and integration of Greek working class immigrants in the city of Toronto, Canada: A situational approach." International Migration Review, 4, 1969:44-70.

Nahirney and Fishman, J. "American immigrant groups: Ethnic identification and the problem of generations." Sociological Review, 13, 311-326, 1965.

Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1975.

O'Bryan, K., Reitz, J., and Kuplowska, O. Non-Official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism. Ottawa: Sec. of State, 1975.

Palmer, H. Land of the Second Chance: A History of Ethnic Groups in Southern Alberta. Lethbridge: The Lethbridge Herald, 1972.

_____, (ed.). Immigration and the Rise of Multiculturalism. Vancouver: Copp Clark Publishing, 1975.

Parai, L. Immigration and Emigration of Professional and Skilled Manpower During the Post-War Period. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, June, 1965.

Parsons, T. "Some theoretical considerations on the nature and trends of changes of ethnicity." In Glazer and Moynihan (eds.), Ethnicity, op. cit., 53-99.

Patterson, O. "Context and choice in ethnic allegiances: A theoretical framework and the Caribbean case study." Ibid., 305-349.

Peterson, W. Planned Migration: The Social Determinants of the Dutch-Canadian Movement. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1955.

_____. The Politics of Population. London: Victor Gallanz Ltd., 1964.

Porter, J. The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Rees-Powell, A. "Differentials in the interaction of Dutch and Italian immigrants in Edmonton." International Migration, 4, 1966:100-113.

Reid, F. The Supply of Immigrants to Canadian Cities, 1921-1961. M.A. Thesis, Queen's, 1973.

Richardson, A. "Some psycho-social aspects of British emigration to Australia." British Journal of Psychology, 10, 1959:327-337.

Richmond, A. "The standard of living of post-war immigrants in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 2, 1965:41-51.

Richmond, A. "Demographic and family characteristics of British immigrants returning from Canada." International Migration, 4, 1966:21-25.

_____. Post-War Immigrants in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

_____. "Sociology of migration in industrial and post-industrial societies." In Jackson (ed.), op. cit., 262.

_____. "Aspects of the absorption and adaptation of immigrants." Canadian Immigration and Population Study. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1974.

Rosenberg, M. The Logic of Survey Analysis. London: Basic Books Inc., 1968.

Samuel, T. "Migration of Canadians to the U.S.A.: The causes." International Migration, 7, 1969.

Stone, O. "On the interaction of mobility dimensions in theory on migration decisions." The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12, 1975:95-100.

Timlin, M. "Canadian immigration policy: An analysis." International Migration, 3, 1965.

Troper, H. Only Farmers Need Apply: Official Canadian Government Encouragement of Immigration from the U.S., 1896-1911. Toronto: Griffen House, 1972.

Uyeki, E. "Correlates of ethnic identification." American Journal of Sociology, 65, 1960:468-474.

Vallee, F. "Regionalism and ethnicity: The French-Canadian case." In Card, B. (ed.), Perspectives on Regions and Regionalism. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1969: 19-25.

Vanderkamp, J. "Mobility behavior in the Canadian labor force." Special Study No. 16. Economic Council of Canada, 1975.

Warwick, D., and Leninger, C. The Sample Survey: Theory and Practice. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Welch, Ruth. Migration Research and Migration in Britain: A Selected Bibliography. London: The University of Birmingham, Occasional Paper No. 14, 1970.

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF THE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE SAMPLE

Estimates of the Population Size

Although exact figures on the size of the target population are not available, estimations of the size reveal that it is between 6.9% and 8.2% of the overall German population of Edmonton.

Estimate Number One

The number of male Edmonton Germans whose birthplace was either Eastern or Western Europe is 7,125 (Census:1971). Subtracting those who arrived before 1946 (1,675) and those who arrived after 1968 (285) leaves 5,165 (Census:1971). However, this figure is composed of all age groups. Since 97.6% of the O'Bryan random sample of German immigrants were between 1 and 50 years of age, and since this age range more than covers that utilized by this study, then the use of 97.6% is a conservative estimate (1975:433). Under the assumption that the age range of Edmonton post-war immigrants will approximate that found for O'Bryan's sample, then 97.6% of 5,165 or 5,041 is the German population with the same characteristics as those of this sample. However, since this

study is of male household heads only, and since 85% of Edmonton German families are headed by males, then it follows that the target population is 85% of 5,041, or 4,285 (Census: 1971).

Estimate Number Two

The Census shows that those who consider their ethnicity to be German, who were born outside Canada, and who arrived between 1946 and 1968 total 6,105 males. Assuming that 97.6% of these were in the age range of 25 to 64 in 1971 leaves 6,106; and, 85% of this equals 5,064.

The Sample as a Proportion of the Population

Rounding estimates number one and two leaves an estimated target population of between 4,300 and 5,100 German males between the ages of 0 and 50 at the time of immigration. Since the Census shows that there are 62,440 Germans of all ages, faiths, sexes, and generation-Canadian in Edmonton, then our target population is between 6.9% and 8.2% of the total Edmonton German population (1971). Since we sampled 78 from the overall German population, then our sample is between 1.8% and 1.5% of the total Edmonton German population.

Possible Sources of Sample Bias

Although approximately 20 of the respondents were obtained by drawing their names from citizenship lists, this

method proved to be too inefficient given the broad range of immigrant types to be sampled, it biased the sample with respondents who had received their citizenship in 1975, and did not provide enough names for the purpose of the study. Consequently, the remainder of the sample was obtained by suggestions of names by leaders of German ethnic organizations, and by referral from those who had been interviewed. Although attention was paid to obtaining as broad a sample as possible, in some cases this aim was resisted by circumstances beyond the author's control. For example, the German Catholic leader refused to allow his parishioners' names to be released. Unfortunately, this refusal led to the underrepresentation of the German Catholic community in this study. Table 14 shows that the 1971 Census estimates the number of German Catholics at 23.5% of the Germans in Edmonton, while the 1975 data on all five major cities provided by O'Bryan et al., estimates this to be 21% of the German population (1975:458). Thus, this sample overrepresents the Protestants and the unaffiliated, and underrepresents the German Catholics.

Table 15 shows the distribution of the obtained sample ages at the time of immigration compared to those obtained by O'Bryan et al. (1975:433).

In terms of age at the time of immigration, the obtained sample approximates that obtained by the O'Bryan random sample.

Table 14

Distributions of German Religious Preferences

Types of Data	Religious Preference None	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Other	N
O'Bryan et al. (all five cities)	17.0	57.4	21.0	4.3	303,874
Census of Canada (Edmonton Males)	6.7	57.3	23.5	12.2	31,220
Study Sample (Edmonton Males)	27.0	65.4	3.0	4.0	78

Sources: O'Bryan et al., 1975:458; Census of Canada:1971; Population Religious Denominations by Ethnic Groups:20-2.

Table 15

Frequency and Percent Distributions of German and Other Ethnic Immigrant Ages at the Time of Immigration

Age at Time of Immigration in Years	Type of Sample: Thesis Frequency	Thesis %	O'Bryan et al. Frequency	O'Bryan et al. %
0-5	1	1.3	2,448	0.3
6-11	4	5.1	26,077	3.3
12-17	12	15.4	73,893	9.3
18-25	34	43.6	333,945	42.0
26-35	25	28.2	222,191	27.9
36-50	5	6.4	117,378	14.8
N =	78	100.0	795,810	100.0

Source: O'Bryan et al., 1975:433.

APPENDIX B

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Type of German _____

1. Region of birth _____(name of town) Size_____

2. Region of father's birth _____name of town)

3. What were your occupations in your last five years in Germany?

	NAME OF COMPANY	POSITION	YEARS	ANNUAL SALARY
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

4. How many countries other than Germany and Canada have you lived in for one year or more?

COUNTRY	PERIOD OF RESIDENCE	REASON FOR LEAVING

5. How many countries other than Canada did you seriously consider immigrating to but changed your mind?

COUNTRY	REASON FOR NOT IMMIGRATING

6. In which year did you first begin to think of immigrating to Canada? _____

7. What made you think of Canada at that time? _____

8. In which year did you definitely decide you would immigrate to Canada? _____

9. Why did you immigrate to Canada?

10. How satisfied were you with your life in Germany?

_____ very satisfied
_____ satisfied
_____ not very satisfied
_____ very unhappy

11. Please explain your answer to the above. _____
_____
_____
_____

12. The following questions asked you to describe how much your tried to compare conditions between Canad and Germany before immigrating.

	THOROUGHLY	SOME	LITTLE	NONE
Housing	____	____	____	____
Earnings	____	____	____	____
Income tax rates	____	____	____	____
Social security costs and benefits	____	____	____	____

13. When searching for information about Canada, which of the following sources did you use? (specify as many as apply)

_____ newspapers and magazines ( )
_____ friends and relatives ( )
_____ government books ( )
_____ church organizations ( )
_____ government officers ( )
_____ other (please specify) ( )

14. Rank order these sources from most to least used.

15. At the time you left Germany were you

_____ married _____ single _____ widowed _____ divorced

16. How many children did you have? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 ?

17. Did you consider your financial position in Germany to be:

_____ below average
_____ average
_____ above average
_____ wealthy

18. How old were you when you arrived in Canada? _____

19. Year of arrival in Canada? _____

20. In your first five years in Canada what did you work at?

FIRM	POSITION	ANNUAL SALARY	REASONS FOR LEAVING

21. In which year did you become a Canadian citizen? _____

22. How many years had you lived in Canada before becoming a Canadian citizen? _____

23. Why did you hesitate? _____

24. Why did you decide to become a citizen of Canada? _____

25. How often do you attend church services?

_____ more than once/week
_____ about once/week
_____ about once/2 weeks
_____ about once/month
_____ rarely
_____ never

25a. What is the name of your church? _____

25b. Percent German? _____

26. Please list the first names only of your five closest friends in Canada. (1)_____ (2)_____
(3)_____ (4)_____ (5)_____

27. Indicate the ethnic group each of your friends was born into.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

28. Do you belong to any organizations?

NAME OF ORGANIZATION	ATTENDANCE	COMMITTEE-SHIP	REASON FOR BELONGING

29. How frequently do you speak German with your children?

_____ all of the time or most of the time
_____ at least once a day
_____ at least once a week
_____ once a month
_____ rarely
_____ never
_____ does not apply

30. The respondent very clearly introduced the subject of war guilt during the interview? _____ yes _____ no

31. During your experience in Canada have you ever had occasion to think that Canadians are hostile to people of German background because of their part in World War II?
_____ yes _____ no

32. If yes, please describe the circumstances which led you to believe that this was occurring. _____
_____
_____

33. Would you say that this attitude was characteristic of:

_____ all Canadians
_____ about 3/4
_____ about 1/2
_____ about 1/4
_____ less than 1/4
_____ just a few
_____ none

34. How many years of formal education have you had?

_____ six or less years
_____ seven to nine
_____ ten to twelve
_____ thirteen or more

35. Do you hold any diplomas or university degrees?
_____ yes _____ no

DEGREE OR DIPLOMA	INSTITUTION	YEAR	SPECIALTY AREA

36. What is the combined income of all of the members of your immediate family at your disposal?

_____ $9,999 or less
_____ $10,000-19,999
_____ $20,000-29,999
_____ $30,000 or over

37. Do you consider your present financial position in Canada to be

_____ below average
_____ average
_____ above average
_____ wealthy

38. For the following questions give the response which best indicates the way you feel. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know.)

	SA	A	D	SD	DK
1. All Germans should make an honest attempt to learn German.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The German language is more important than any other language for Canadians.	1	2	3	4	5
3. It is tremendously important to speak German in the home so that it may be preserved for future generations.	1	2	3	4	5
4. It is embarrassing for me to see Germans speaking German in a mixed group.	1	2	3	4	5

	SA	A	D	SD	DK
5. My religion is a real source of strength to me	1	2	3	4	5
6. It is important for Germans to be regular church attenders.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Being a member of the German group and religion is something I acknowledge because of my birth, but I do not feel it important enough to actively participate in it.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The idea of God has tremendous significance in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
9. For me, it makes very little difference what ethnic group the person I marry (or married) belongs to.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Unless a German has good reasons, he should not marry an outsider under any circumstances.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Germans should not have an unfavorable attitude toward those who marry outside the group.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Parents who discourage their children from dating people of other ethnic backgrounds do a disservice to their children.	1	2	3	4	5
13. It is important to me to have most of my close friends within the German group.	1	2	3	4	5
14. The presence of other members of the German group close by give me a feeling of warmth and security.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My friends at work who are of a different ethnic background seldom seem to become close friends.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My family seems to take a less favorable attitude toward my friends who are of a different ethnic background.	1	2	3	4	5

	SA	A	D	SD	DK
17. All Germans should be considerably more involved in German organizations othn other organizations	1	2	3	4	5
18. Ethnic organizations are wonderful because they allow mee to take an active part in the affairs of one's ethnic group.	1	2	3	4	5
19. German organizations are fine for the older people, but they do not actively encourage the participation of young people.	1	2	3	4	5
20. German organizations seem to be too concerned with narrow issues instead of the important issues of the world.	1	2	3	4	5

39. This question is often a difficult one for people to answer because it asks you to describe how others feel. Take as much time with your answer as you want.

People of German background who are now citizens of Canada often feel very differently about their backgrounds. The express this by the ways they describe themselves. Some describe themselves as Canadians of German background, others call themselves German-Canadians, others call themselves Canadians, and still others call themselves Germans.

On the basis of your experience with people who have used these terms to describe themsleves, I would like you to tell me how you think <u>they</u> feel about their 'old' and 'new' countries and cultures.

a. Canadian of German background _____

b. Canadian only _____

c. German-Canadian _____

d. German only _____

40. Which of the above best describes you? _____

41. When you hear the term 'multiculturalism' used, what does it mean to you? _____
_____
_____

42. Does multiculturalism affect you personally? _____

43. If so, how? _____
_____
_____

APPENDIX C

THE ITEMS COMPRISING THE DIMENSIONS

The Language Dimension

1. All Germans should make an honest attempt to learn German.
2. It is tremendously important to speak German in the home so that it may be preserved for future generations.

The Religion Dimension

1. My religion is a real source of strength for me.
2. It is important for Germans to be regular church attenders.
3. The idea of God has tremendous significance in my life.

The Endogamy Dimension

1. For me, it makes very little difference what ethnic group the person I marry (or married) belongs to.
2. Parents who discourage their children from dating people of other ethnic backgrounds do a disservice to their children.
3. Unless a German has good reasons, he should not marry an outsider under any circumstances.

The Friendship Dimension

1. It is important to me to have most of my close friends within the German group.

2. My friends at work who are of a different ethnic background seldom seem to become close friends.
3. My family seems to take a less favorable attitude toward my friends who are of a different ethnic background.